

# AGENDA



For a meeting of the
<b>COUNCIL</b>
to be held on
<b>THURSDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2008</b>
at
<b>2.00 PM</b>
in the
<b>COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM</b>
<b>Ian Yates, Acting Chief Executive</b>

**Members of the Council are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.**

**1. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM**

The public open forum will commence at **2.00 p.m.** and the following formal business of the Council will commence at **2.30 p.m.** or whenever the public open forum ends, if earlier.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members are asked to declare any interests in matters for consideration at the meeting.

**4. MINUTES**

Minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 19 June 2008 and the extraordinary meeting held on 14 August 2008. **(Enclosure)**

**5. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ENGAGEMENTS)**

- List of civic events undertaken since June 2008;
- Response from Hazel Blears MP to the Council's concerns about the development of garden land. **(Enclosure)**



*"Listening Learning Delivering"*

**South Kesteven District Council**

**STAMFORD • GRANTHAM • BOURNE • THE DEEPINGS**

- 6. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2008/09 TO 2010/2011**  
Report number CHFR116 by the Interim Corporate Head of Finance  
(Section 151 Officer) **(Enclosure)**
- 7. REVISION OF THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME**  
Report number CHFR117 by the Assets & Resources Portfolio Holder.  
**(Enclosure)**
- 8. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF CAR PARKING CHARGES IN BOURNE**  
Report number CHFR118 by the Interim Corporate Head, Finance  
(Section 151 Officer). **(Enclosure)**
- 9. ANNUAL REVIEW OF PRIORITIES**  
Report number SD022 by the Strategic Director. **(Enclosure)**
- 10. ADOPTION OF LOCAL LIST OF INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED WITH AN APPLICATION UNDER THE PLANNING ACTS**  
Report number PLA713a by the Economic Portfolio Holder.  
**(Enclosure)**

*[The proposed Local List was circulated with the Cabinet agenda for its meeting on 11 August 2008.*

*Due to its size, it has not been re-circulated.]*

*The document can be accessed electronically via the Council's website: [www.southkesteven.gov.uk](http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk) by selecting the Local Democracy menu; Agendas and minutes; Cabinet; 11 August 2008.*

- 11. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION; RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**  
The Chairman of the Constitution Committee to submit the recommendations of the committee concerning the scheme of delegation as contained in the minutes of its meeting held on 14 July 2008. **(Enclosure)**
- 12. LEADER'S REPORT ON URGENT NON KEY DECISIONS**  
In accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.3, the Leader to submit report number CAB009 on non key decisions taken under special urgency provisions. **(Enclosure)**
- 13. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL**  
The Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee to present the annual scrutiny report number DEM017. **(Enclosure)**

**14. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

To note the list of questions asked under Council procedure rule 11.1 as circulated at the start of the meeting and their reference to the relevant Policy Development Group.

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE  
RULE 12:**

**(1) From Councillor Maureen Jalili:**

"This Council deplores the continuing unfair bias of the Government in favour of metropolitan areas. This is eroding the infrastructure of county and rural areas and leading, in areas like South Kesteven District Council, to a situation whereby our county towns and villages are unable to sustain their new generations because of lack of employment opportunities, absence of local transport systems and housing which has been priced beyond their reach.

We call on the Government to address these issues urgently and reverse this decline. We seek particularly action on the heavy burden being placed on incomes by rising fuel prices in areas where there is no local transport system and people have to rely on cars."

**16. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON  
OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT**

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**The next meeting of the full Council will be on 30 October 2008.**

**Deadline for Notices of Motion: 2pm on Friday 17 October 2008.**

# MINUTES

## COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 19 JUNE 2008

2.00 PM



---

### PRESENT

Councillor Mike Exton Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams  
Councillor Ray Auger  
Councillor Harrish Bisnauthsing  
Councillor Christine Brough  
Councillor Robert Broughton  
Councillor Paul Carpenter  
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright  
Councillor Elizabeth Channell  
Councillor George Chivers  
Councillor Michael Cook  
Councillor Nick Craft  
Councillor Alan Davidson  
Councillor John Dawson  
Councillor Stuart Farrar  
Councillor Mrs Joyce Gaffigan  
Councillor John Harvey  
Councillor Robert Hearmon  
Councillor David Higgs  
Councillor Trevor Holmes  
Councillor Ian Stokes  
Councillor Sam Jalili  
Councillor Mrs Maureen Jalili  
Councillor Kenneth Joynson  
Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown

Councillor Albert Victor Kerr  
Councillor Reg Lovelock M.B.E.  
Councillor Stuart McBride  
Councillor Andrew Moore  
Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal  
Councillor Alan Parkin  
Councillor Bob Russell  
Councillor Bob Sandall  
Councillor Susan Sandall  
Councillor Trevor Scott  
Councillor Ian Selby  
Councillor Mrs Judy Smith  
Councillor John Smith  
Councillor Peter Stephens  
Councillor Mike Taylor  
Councillor Jeffrey Thompson  
Councillor Frank Turner  
Councillor Andrea Webster  
Councillor Tom Webster  
Councillor Avril Williams  
Councillor Mike Williams  
Councillor Paul Wood  
Councillor Raymond Wootten

### OFFICERS

Acting Chief Executive  
Strategic Directors (IY and TB)

### OFFICERS

Legal Services Manager (Monitoring Officer)

---



*"Listening Learning Delivering"*

**South Kesteven District Council**

STAMFORD • GRANTHAM • BOURNE • THE DEEPINGS

---

Corporate Head, Finances & Resources  
Corporate Head, Sustainable Communities  
Corporate Head, Corporate & Customer Services

Finance & Risk Management Service Manager  
Democracy Services Manager  
Principal Democracy Officer  
Scrutiny Support Officer

---

## **24. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM**

[2:00 – 2:12pm]

### **Question 1 – From Mr T. Burns**

As Mr Burns was not present at the meeting, the Chairman confirmed that the question would not be read out and would be held over for the September meeting.

### **Question 2 – From Mrs. Mary Patrick**

#### **To Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal (Leader of the Council)**

Mrs. Neal, does South Kesteven District Council, staff and cabinet members stand by the three core values – “Listening, Learning and Delivering”?

#### **Reply from Councillor Mrs. Neal**

Thank you Mrs Patrick. The Council has agreed to the core values of Listening Learning and Delivering and we are working to apply this approach in all that we do. These values were adopted because we recognise that as an organisation delivering a variety of services there may be occasion where we have fallen short of these aims. We do hope that by listening to feedback we can learn and improve and work hard to deliver better services centred around the needs of all our customers.

#### **Mrs. Patrick’s Supplementary Question**

Mrs Neal, the reason I ask this question is there are Members in this chamber and in your staff that do not know that the District Association exists so how can they deliver, listen, learn and deliver because we are having many problems with certain parts of your

staff and certain departments. We listen, we learn and we are delivering at the DA. Because there are Councillors in here that don't know we exist. I'm sorry to have to say this and there is a lot of your staff, and they have told me, they don't know who we are and we do work very, very hard and we help this Council out in many things, we give many suggestions and we work our socks off and we do deliver.

### **Reply from Councillor Mrs Neal**

I don't think anyone would deny people like Mrs Patrick work very hard and we take on board the comments that she has made and try to make inroads into the issues that she has raised.

### **QUESTION 3 – From Mrs. Mary Patrick**

#### **To Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal (Leader of the Council)**

Mrs. Neal, have the new contractors for maintenance of Plumbing and Central Heating guaranteed a three star service?

### **Reply from Councillor Mrs. Neal**

My understanding was Mr Chairman that you were going to direct the Question to Councillor Carpenter as that is his portfolio.

### **Reply from Councillor Carpenter**

The obvious answer is yes, of course, Mrs Patrick, the new contractors do operate under a three star service.

### **Mrs. Patrick's Supplementary Question**

Thank you Mr Carpenter. The reason I ask it is the question is we believe that this is going to be a sub-standard service and we, the tenants' representatives, are frightened because at the moment we are under the impression that new firm will not come out at weekends and will not come out on emergencies and this is what we are frightened of. This is why I have asked the question and I would like surety for the tenants. Thank you very much.

### **Reply from Councillor Carpenter**

Obviously the new contractors will work under the three star service I hope that your fears are never justified. I can certainly investigate into that. I have made one or two notes with regard to the contractor

and it says here in extracts from the contract that “tenants will receive written notification of appointments for servicing appliances.....and 24 hour emergency call-out for heating breakdowns including weekends and bank holidays”. Now I am assuming that you’re not necessarily referring to emergency calls but standard calls. What I will do is look further into this and get more information for you Mrs. Patrick.

## **25. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs Bosworth, Helyar, Howard, Jock Kerr, Martin-Mayhew, Nicholson, Mrs Radley, Mrs Spencer-Gregson and Wheat.

## **26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor Broughton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 36 by virtue of owning a property with a large garden which would increase in value if planning permission were sought for development. He left the room for the duration of the item and took no part in the debate or vote.

Councillor Dawson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 36 for the same reason. He left the room for the duration of the item and took no part in the debate or vote.

Councillor Thompson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in minute 36 by virtue of presently having a consultant handling the disposal of land owned by himself. He left the room for the duration of the item and took no part in the debate or vote.

## **27. MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING HELD ON 17TH APRIL 2008**

Due to the unavailability of the electronic voting system, in accordance with Council procedure rule 16.3 (b) the vote was taken by a show of hands.

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2008 were confirmed as a correct record.

## **28. COMMUNICATIONS (INCLUDING CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS)**

Following concerns raised at the meeting of 17<sup>th</sup> April 2008 regarding Quentin Davies' decision to sign up to the early day motion in support of allowing Gurkhas who have served four years in the British Army prior to 1997 to apply for indefinite leave to remain in the UK a letter had been sent to Quentin Davies M.P. and a copy sent to the Prime Minister's office. Circulated with the agenda were the responses received from both. The Chairman noted that the replies were not extensive and that if Mr Davies attended a future Scrutiny Committee meeting to discuss Post Office closures that the matter be raised with him at that time.

Also circulated with the agenda was a list of the Chairman's engagements which was received and noted.

## **29. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE: REVISED INCOME**

### **DECISION:**

- (1) To approve the following Supplementary Estimates together with the Summary Revenue Estimate 2008/9 and Reserves Statement as attached at appendix A of report CHFR106**
  - i. Supplementary estimate for LABGI Income be approved for £544,229 and this be transferred to the Capital Reserve to support future Capital investment to support the Council's priority for the Town Centre Development of Bourne and Grantham.**
  - ii. Supplementary estimate of £25k income from Area Based Grant be approved and this be held in working balances and allocated once the Local Area Agreement has been finalised.**
- (2) To note that the Association of District Council Debenture will be repaid on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008**
- (3) That the Cabinet receive an update on this and makes a recommendation on the potential use of the resource once final details are announced.**
- (4) To approve the expenditure in accordance with the bid submission to the Regional Housing Board. The portfolio holder be authorised to approve the**



**expenditure upon written confirmation of the bid.  
The detail of which is:**

**£ 50,000 for a thousand property surveys by EAGA  
£100,000 for grants on non decent homes  
£100,000 for grants on warm front top up grants  
£120,000 for staffing costs  
£ 40,000 for countywide housing condition survey  
£ 40,000 for grants on empty properties  
£ 40,000 for grants on renewable heating systems**

- (5) To approve the amended capital programme as shown at appendix A of the addendum to report CHFR106 by the Resources and Assets portfolio holder and agree that the Regional Housing Board grant is utilised to finance this expenditure.**

The report numbered CHFR106 and the addendum to the report were presented and the recommendations moved by the Leader of the Council. This was then seconded. As this was the first sighting of the addendum by the Members and due to some technical difficulties with the voting system the Chairman agreed to a short adjournment of the Council.

[Adjournment between 2:18 and 2:24pm]

A debate took place and a number of issues were raised. Concerns were raised that £120,000 for staffing appeared to be a large proportion of the £490,000 received from the Regional Housing Board. There was further concern that the £544,000 mentioned in the original report was all to be invested in development for Grantham and Bourne, which were already Category A priorities, and that this was not very even handed. It was noted that the Housing Revenue Account Useable Capital Receipts Reserve was reducing considerably from £4.7m over the next few years and that this money was far better used on improving properties as soon as possible than remaining in the bank.

The Corporate Head Finances and Resources apologised to Members for the lateness of the addendum as she had been awaiting official confirmation of the award. Written confirmation was due to be received shortly. In response to the issues raised, the staffing cost of £120,000 would be entirely funded by the Regional Housing Board. It was felt it wise to include costs of delivering the programme in the bid, which included temporary staff. Therefore an extra provision for this was included in the bid. It was further noted that the £544,000

was financing in terms of the Capital Programme for previously identified expenditure. Finally, the reserves statement had not changed and the diminishing HRA Useable Capital Receipts Reserve was the same as that which had been previously seen by the Council when setting the budget. The diminishing reserves were an issue that the Council would need to address in the future. However, it was noted that the Reserve Statement would change at the closure of accounts.

The electronic voting system now having been restored to full functionality, a vote was taken on the motion and was duly carried.

### **30. APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM SECTION 151 OFFICER (CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)**

#### **DECISION:**

**That the Council designate Mr Richard Wyles as the Council's acting section 151 officer with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> July 2008 until a permanent appointment of a new Corporate Head of Finance and Resources is made.**

It was noted that Under s151 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council was required to *"make arrangements for the proper administration of their financial affairs and shall secure that one of their officers has responsibility for the administration of those affairs"*.

The acting Chief Executive presented report number CHFR105 with the amendment to the recommendation to insert the word "acting" before "section 151 officer". This was then moved and seconded.

A discussion then took place and questions were raised. Members requested that the Chief Executive clarify how Mr Wyles was qualified to assume the position and also as to why the Council was not using the departure as an opportunity to review the structure of the senior management team.

The acting Chief Executive, in recommending the suitability of Mr Wyles to the position, directed Members towards the Monitoring Officer's comments in the report and noted that Mr Wyles was significantly experienced, possessed extensive knowledge and had been guided by the outgoing section 151 officer. In addition he was a fully qualified accountant. The position would also provide an excellent development opportunity in the interim until a permanent appointment was made.

The acting Chief Executive expressed to Members that a review of the management structure was good practice and noted that this issue was discussed, however it was felt that as the present structure had only been in place for a short period of time it was more appropriate to continue to consolidate the appointments within the Council and to provide some clarity about the way forward. In future, if no appointment was made, the situation could be revisited.

On being put to a vote the motion was carried.

### **31. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION: RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**

#### **DECISION:**

- (1) That the Constitution at Part 3 is amended under the heading of "Development Control Lead Professional" by the insertion of the following paragraph 17:-**

***To authorise approval to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as Amended) on a delegated planning application approval provided that the Section 106 Agreement does not contain any financial contributions.***

- (2) That the Constitution at Part 3, Rule 2(b) and 2(c) be amended for a trial period of 12 months providing that when proposing a recommendation against the clearly expressed advice of the Officer the members so proposing and seconding provide with their proposal the necessary planning reasons for their action. Should such reasons not be provided or the Development Control Lead Professional considers that the reason(s) given are not Planning Reasons or can not be supported by evidence then the existing rule as set out in Part 3, Rule 2(b) and 2(c) of the Constitution will remain.**
- (3) That the Sponsorship Protocol as agreed by the Governance and Audit Committee at their meeting on 10th April 2008 be included within the Constitution.**

The minutes of the meeting of the Constitution Committee of 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2008 were presented to Council by the Vice-Chairman of the Constitution Committee. It was noted that no changes had been made to the Constitution with regard to notices of motion. The recommendations of the Committee were put to the Council and were moved and seconded.

A discussion then ensued and a number of issues were raised. The issuing of a Policy Pack for the Development Control Committee was welcomed. It was noted that regular updates regarding section 106 agreements had been agreed but these had not yet happened and that these needed to be produced for Members. The Chairmen of the Governance and Audit Committee and Resources Policy Development Group both noted that the issue of section 106 agreements was something that would be looked into.

Concerns were raised that a number of section 106 agreements may not have been acted upon, whether it be by the developer not providing the money required, the developer not carrying out promised works or the money having been provided by developers but work not being performed by the Council. There was concern that there was a lack of action on some section 106 agreements. Members highlighted some examples which they felt had not been acted upon.

The acting Chief Executive clarified that the Council entered into a number of section 106 agreements with developers and was working to ensure that all of these were properly actioned at the right time. It was noted that the trigger point for some section 106 agreements could be significantly after when a section 106 agreement was agreed. Moving forwards, the Council was looking to appoint an officer to deal with section 106 agreements. For the benefit of Members the difference between "financial contributions" and "financial implications" was clarified as being that "financial implications" covered a number of areas, such as a developer providing play equipment, whereas "financial contributions" was actually a sum of money.

It was noted that recommendation to Council regarding section 106 agreements was in relation to social housing and was not to do with money.

The Council's Monitoring Officer offered guidance to the members prior to voting that as this was a matter for the Council there was no need for members of the Development Control Committee to declare

an interest.

The Council then took the three recommendations from the Constitution Committee separately. Following votes on all three recommendations, the motion to approve the recommendations was duly carried.

## **32. REPRESENTATION ON OUTSIDE BODIES: LEISURE TRUST**

### **DECISION:**

**That the Councillor Thompson be appointed to represent the Council on the Leisure Trust.**

Report number AFM0056 was presented to the Council by the portfolio holder for Access and Engagement. The Council was to appoint a Member to represent the Council on the Leisure Trust. It was highlighted that the Member nominated should ideally have a genuine interest in leisure together with previous knowledge of leisure and the utilisation of the Council's assets.

Some questions were raised regarding the appointment. There was no indication of the length of the appointment. It was usual for appointments to be made for either one year or four years. It was felt that during the formative stages of the Trust it was hoped to make a long term appointment, ideally for five years. This raised the question of what the situation would be in the event that the chosen representative of the Council was not re-elected at the next election. In this case the answer was that another representative would have to be nominated by the Council. There was some concern that the Council would not have a majority of representation on the Trust, to which the Monitoring Officer answered that the Council could not be in control of the Trust.

Councillor Thompson was nominated and seconded. A number of Members spoke to confirm Councillor Thompson's suitability for the role and that he had done more than most to further the cause of sport and leisure within the Council.

There were no other nominations to represent the Council on the Leisure Trust. On being put to the vote, the motion to appoint Councillor Thompson was duly carried. Councillor Thompson thanked the Members for their support.

### **33. LEADER'S REPORT ON URGENT KEY AND NON KEY DECISIONS**

The report numbered CAB008 by the Leader of the Council was noted.

### **34. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

One question on notice had been submitted by Councillor Maureen Jalili and referred to the Resources PDG.

### **35. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12: BY COUNCILLOR PAUL WOOD**

#### **DECISION:**

**That no action be taken following the Council's decision not to support the Notice of Motion by Councillor Wood.**

Councillor Wood introduced his Notice of Motion for the Council to make weekly collections of black bins during the summer months. He noted that this was being undertaken by Lincoln City Council. During the summer it was suggested that 14 days between collections was too long, and that if someone missed a collection due to being on holiday, then it would be a month between collections. In the hot weather this could create problems with odour and for health. Councillor Wood indicated that he was not looking for the service to be implemented this year, but to be considered for next year.

Speaking in support of the motion, a number of Members raised the issue of properties that did not have wheelie bins and were still having to use bags. It was noted that in these areas where a bag could be opened and the contents spilled that this might create health problems. There was also the issue that odours became problematic where bags were left in sunlight. It was noted that the World Health Organisation recommended weekly collections.

A number of Members spoke against the motion. The cost of providing the service in Lincoln was put at £1.2m. It was noted that odours were not a problem where rubbish was properly disposed of. A Member recalled that scaremongering regarding problems with rats had not materialised. There had been a high satisfaction rate with the service and recycling rates were 52%, with a target of achieving 55%. It was felt that weekly collections of black bins would not encourage people to recycle more. It was noted that changing mid year to weekly collections would just create confusion and create further pressure on the Customer Service Centre. It was also noted

that a heatwave could occur at a point outside of the proposed three months of weekly collections. A Member noted that there was a lifestyle change issue and that people should not be disposing of as much food as they do presently.

The Corporate Head Finances and Resources informed Members that the cost of implementing a weekly service for three months over the summer would be just under £780k, which would result in a potential Council Tax increase of 15% unless other Council services were reduced to make savings elsewhere.

In summing up, Councillor Wood noted that he was not looking for Council Tax increases, but rather for the proposed weekly collections to be included when the budget was being calculated.

Having been seconded, the motion was put to a vote and was defeated.

[The Council went into recess between 3:30 and 3:49pm]

### **36. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12: BY COUNCILLOR MIKE WILLIAMS**

#### **DECISION:**

**Following a rapid increase in complaints from the people we represent and concerns raised by members, this Council writes to the relevant Government department to express its displeasure at the government policy of designating gardens as brown field sites which has opened the door to a surge in planning applications from garden grabbing developers whose actions are slowly destroying the pleasant environments in which many of our citizens live.**

Before the motion was put to the Council, a number of Members raised concerns as to whether they should declare an interest. After hearing advice from the Monitoring Officer, three Members declared personal and prejudicial interests and took no part in the debate.

[Councillors Broughton, Dawson and Thompson left the Chamber at 3:58pm]

Councillor Williams moved the motion as amended and this was then seconded. He then agreed to accept an alteration to his motion to insert the words "this Council writes to the relevant Government department to express its displeasure at" with the deletion of the

word “deplores”. This amendment was agreed by his seconder.

Speaking in support of the motion, Members noted that considerable numbers of gardens were being developed on, and that 72% of brownfield development was on gardens. It was noted that there was an environmental impact and increased risk of flooding where gardens had been taken over for development. Members remarked that once a garden had gone for development purposes, then it was lost forever. A Member raised the issue that owners of properties with large gardens were effectively forced into seeking planning permission in order to realize the true financial value of the property when selling it. It was further noted that effectively the policy towards development on brownfield sites, including gardens, took the decision away from elected Members and gave it to government inspectors.

Speaking against the motion it was noted by a Member that all planning issues should be treated on their individual merits and in some cases this development allowed people to remain in their homes when they might otherwise not be able to afford to. One Member remarked that the motion was overtly political and that it required modification as some exclusions to a blanket opposition to garden development was necessary.

In summing up, Councillor Williams stated that the motion was not politically motivated. The issue at hand was that private gardens were not brownfield sites at all and should not be treated as such.

Having been moved and seconded, the motion was put to a vote and was duly carried.

[Councillors Dawson and Thompson returned to the Chamber at 4:20pm]

### **37. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN UNDER COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12: BY COUNCILLOR IAN SELBY**

#### **DECISION:**

**In the light of the recent announcement by Marks and Spencer to withdraw its association with Northern foods at it's Grantham food production site, this Council, as far as it is able, will fully support the plight of employees at Fenland Foods.**

Councillor Selby moved the motion and it was then seconded.



Councillor Selby noted that there was the potential for more than 700 jobs to be lost in Grantham if the plant was closed and that the Council had done some work with regard to this. It was noted that if the worst case did happen then there would be a requirement for a significant level of help for many of these people.

Speaking against the motion a Member remarked that whilst all were concerned by the effects of closure, the Council had been active on the issue since the news was first broken. A Member also noted that the motion was grammatically incorrect and required amendment.

A number of Members spoke in support of the motion. A Member noted that there was disappointment with Marks and Spencer for terminating the contract whilst making large profits, however it was also noted that management should not have left themselves so exposed by only supplying one firm and that Marks and Spencer were making a purely business decision. A Member noted that whilst a lot of work had been done to date, could the Council do anything further, such as helping to fund the Citizens Advice Bureau to stay open for longer hours, in order to provide practical help for those left unemployed. The acting Chief Executive confirmed that there would be rapid response funding available from the government. It was further noted that workers to the plant came in from other regions and that closure would also affect those providing transport for these workers.

The motion having been seconded it was put to a vote and was duly carried.

### **38. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT**

The Chairman raised the issue that Ms. Sally Marshall, the Corporate Head Finance and Resources, was leaving the Council. The group leaders said that they were sad to see her leaving and that she was very highly regarded. She had been very professional, approachable and accessible and had always provided good advice. It was noted that Ms Marshall was very ambitious and that the Council needed ambitious people. She was going onto a big challenge and it was felt she would be a great success.

In response Ms Marshall stated that she had been proud to serve the Council. The choice of public service had always been one to give something back to the community. She would be sad to leave as she had made many friends within the Council. It was noted that she would retain an interest in proceedings as she was to remain a

resident of the district.

The Chief Executive reported that as a result of the technical difficulties earlier in the meeting, a member of the IT department would attend all Council meetings in future.

The meeting closed at 4:40pm.

# MINUTES

**EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING  
THURSDAY, 14 AUGUST 2008  
2.00 PM**



---

## **PRESENT**

Councillor Mike Exton Chairman

Councillor Bob Adams  
(Vice-Chairman)  
Councillor Ray Auger  
Councillor Pam Bosworth  
Councillor Christine Brough  
Councillor Robert Broughton  
Councillor Paul Carpenter  
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright  
Councillor George Chivers  
Councillor Michael Cook  
Councillor Alan Davidson  
Councillor Stuart Farrar  
Councillor John Harvey  
Councillor Robert Hearmon  
Councillor Bryan Helyar  
Councillor Trevor Holmes  
Councillor Reginald Howard  
Councillor Ian Stokes  
Councillor Mrs Maureen Jalili  
Councillor Sam Jalili  
Councillor Kenneth Joynton

Councillor Mrs Rosemary Kaberry-Brown  
Councillor Jock Kerr  
Councillor Albert Victor Kerr  
Councillor Reg Lovelock M.B.E.  
Councillor Peter Martin-Mayhew  
Councillor Stuart McBride  
Councillor Andrew Moore  
Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal  
Councillor Alan Parkin  
Councillor Mrs Margery Radley  
Councillor Susan Sandall  
Councillor Ian Selby  
Councillor Mrs Maureen Spencer-Gregson O.B.E.  
Councillor Michael Taylor  
Councillor Jeffrey Thompson  
Councillor Andrea Webster  
Councillor Tom Webster  
Councillor Graham Wheat  
Councillor Mike Williams  
Councillor Raymond Wootten

## **OFFICERS**

Acting Chief Executive  
Strategic Director (BA)  
Interim Corporate Head, Finance  
(S.151. Officer)

## **OFFICERS**

Legal Services Manager (Monitoring  
Officer)  
Democracy Services Manager



*"Listening Learning Delivering"*

**South Kesteven District Council**

**STAMFORD • GRANTHAM • BOURNE • THE DEEPINGS**

---

---

*Before the start of formal business, the Chairman mentioned that Councillor Avril Williams was recovering in hospital from a recent operation. Councillor Mike Williams was asked to convey to his wife the best wishes of the Council for a speedy recovery.*

### **39. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bisnauthsing, Miss Channell, Craft, Dawson, Mrs Gaffigan, Higgs, Jock Kerr, Russell, Bob Sandall, Scott, John Smith, Mrs Judy Smith, Turner, Avril Williams, and Wood.

### **40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Wootten declared a personal interest in minute 41 by virtue of his membership of the National Association of Retired Police Officers and the Grantham East Police Panel.

Councillor McBride declared a personal interest in minute 41 as he is a working Police Community Support Officer.

### **41. REVISED COUNCIL TAX 2008/09 AND RE-BILLING**

**DECISION: To approve the reduction in council tax payable of £69.57 per annum for an equivalent Band D property arising from the Government's decision to cap the budget and council tax requirement of the Lincolnshire Police Authority.**

Members had previously been circulated with report number CHFR114 which was presented by the Assets and Resources portfolio holder. The portfolio holder thanked the Interim Corporate Head of Finance for his work on preparing the document before Council and proposed the recommendations contained therein. The motion was seconded.

The Corporate Head explained that the Government's decision to cap Lincolnshire Police Authority's (LPA) budget and council tax requirement for 2008/09 impacted on the amount to be collected from the district's council tax payers. Lincolnshire Police Authority had set a council tax increase of 78.9% to meet its budget requirement. The Government served formal notice on the LPA on 10 July, and this Council as billing authority, that the LPA budget requirement should not exceed 26% increase. The LPA had subsequently revised its precept to 25.9%.

Section 31 (1) b of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 states that the

billing authority must set the council tax following notification of a major precepting authority (in this case LPA) of a substitute amount. There is no change in the council tax requirement for South Kesteven and that of Lincolnshire County Council reported to Council on 3 March 2008. Overall, council tax bills will reduce by £69.57 which is equivalent to £1.34 per week for an equivalent Band D property.

The revised amounts of the LPA precept across each category of dwelling are:

<b>Band A</b>	<b>Band B</b>	<b>Band C</b>	<b>Band D</b>	<b>Band E</b>	<b>Band F</b>	<b>Band G</b>	<b>Band H</b>
110.52	128.94	147.36	<b>165.78</b>	202.62	239.46	276.30	331.56

Members were advised that a re-billing project plan had been prepared in order to issue substitute council tax demands. It was anticipated that the revised bills would be distributed during the first two weeks of September. Payment advice to customers would be issued. In accordance with Section 31 (5) of the Local Government and Finance Act 1992, the Council will be recovering the administrative expenses in respect of the re-billing process from the LPA.

Several members indicated their wish to speak. The first speaker said he had received comments from residents of his ward expressing both relief and anger; relief at the reduction of their council tax bill but anger at the Government's refusal to adequately fund the Lincolnshire Police. The cost of re-billing for Lincolnshire is estimated at £250,000. This amount could have funded 12 full time police officers for one year. This reduction in police resources, he said, would be hard to explain to those recent victims of crime in Harrowby ward.

Another member referred to the reasons behind why this council had to convene this meeting which was at some considerable cost to the people of Lincolnshire. He suggested that the LPA set a precept which it knew would be capped by the Government, asserting that this was a gesture of politics of the worst kind by both the LPA and central Government. The member expressed the view that this Council ought to send a message to the LPA and the Government that it deplores the actions of the LPA in setting a precept it knew would almost certainly be thrown out and the to the latter for refusing to allow the capped adjustment to be carried forward as a credit to 2009/10 precepts to avoid the costs of re-billing. Accordingly he proposed the following addendum to the motion:

*South Kesteven District Council, in setting a revised Band D council tax of £165.78 for the year 2008/09, takes note that this decision is necessitated by the failure of Lincolnshire Police Authority and the Secretary of State to agree a budget to deliver effective policing in Lincolnshire. In acknowledging the cost to the people of Lincolnshire of this failure to be in the order of £1 million, South Kesteven District Council:*

- (a) invites members of the Lincolnshire Police authority to consider their fitness to continue as members of the authority;*
- (b) requests the Secretary of State to recognize the particular problems*

*associated with policing and policing costs in Lincolnshire.*

After other speakers had expressed their concern at the cost of this process and the impact on officer time, the mover of the original motion was asked whether she was prepared to accept this addendum to her motion.

As the mover of the motion had previously been unaware that this addendum was to be put, she requested the Chairman to agree to an adjournment for her group to consider the matter.

Accordingly the Chairman announced that there would be a short adjournment from 2.20pm to 2.25pm.

At the resumption of the meeting, the mover of the motion indicated she was not prepared to accept the addendum to her motion as she did not feel it helpful to criticise the LPA. This, she said, was not the role of this Council today.

In response, a member expressed concern at the necessity to have this recess given that the proposer of the addendum was not criticising the LPA, rather the process. The point of the addendum being that it was the least this Council could do to satisfy its residents that it took its job very seriously.

The mover of the addendum then confirmed he now wished this to be presented as a formal amendment to the motion. The amendment was seconded.

A vote was taken on the amendment and subsequently lost.

A vote was taken on the original motion and carried.

The meeting closed at 2.35p.m.

# Agenda Item 5

## **CHAIRMAN'S CIVIC EVENTS INDEX** **19 June to 4 September 2008**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Ref</b>	<b>Host</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Transport</b>
19.6.08	ME48	Rotary Club Swimarathon (6.30 for 7.00p.m.)	Meres Leisure Centre	Own
21.6.08	ME13	The Deepings Arts Festival	The Deepings School	Own
22.6.08	ME24	Louth Town Council Civic Service	St Mary's RC Church, Louth	Chauffeur
27.6.08	ME30	New College, Stamford Cadet Passing out Parade	Drift Road, Stamford	Own
27.6.08	ME28	Army Benevolent Fund Reception, Beating Retreat and Dinner Party	Petwood Hotel, Woodhall Spa	Chauffeur
28.6.08	ME44	Stamford Festival	Parade through Streets of Stamford	Own
29.6.08	ME34	Market Deeping Town Council Civic Service	St. Guthlacs Parish Church, Market Deeping	Chauffeur
1.7.08	ME31	Mini Olympics at Grantham Meres	Meres Leisure Centre	Own
1.7.08	ME37	Rotary Club of Bourne 40th Charter Anniversary Dinner	Corn Exchange Bourne	Own
3.7.08	ME45	Welland & Deepings I.D.B. Annual Tour of Inspection	Including official opening of new pumping station at Pinchbeck Marsh	Own
6.7.08	ME46	Wisbech Town Council Annual Civic Service	Parish Church of St Peter and St. Paul.	Chauffeur
13.7.08	ME42	Lincs County Council Annual Civic Service	Lincoln Cathedral, followed by Reception in Castle Grounds	Chauffeur
14.7.08	ME47	High Sheriff of Lincolnshire Service for HM Judges	Lincoln Cathedral	Chauffeur
16.7.08	ME48	Barrowby Parish Council Opening of new Pavilion	Barrowby Pavilion	Own
17.7.08	ME32	Opening of Grantham Timeline 3.45-5.30p.m	Fellows Café Grantham 15 Westgate Grantham	Own
18.7.08	ME53	Fenland District Council March and Reception	Fenland District Council Offices	Own

19.7.08	ME35	Royal Logistics Corps Territorial Army Drumhead Service and Garden Party	Prince William of Gloucester Barracks	Chauffeur
20.7.08	ME50	North East Lincs Council Civic Sunday	St. Peter's Church, Cleethorpes followed by Reception at Grimsby Town Hall	Own
22.7.08	ME36	Royal Garden Party	Buckingham Palace	Chauffeur
23.07.08	ME57	Deepings Community Centre Awards		Own
24 and 25.7.08	VC1 ME55	Judging Flowers for Sheltered Housing Scheme	Various	Own
25.7.08	ME52	RAF Cottesmore Families Day	RAF Cottesmore	Own
26.7.08	ME51	ELDC, Official Switch On of Skegness Illuminations	Embassy Theatre	Own
29.7.08	ME60	Scouts & Guides	Lincolnshire Showground	Own
31.7.08	ME73	Opening of Recreation Ground	Stamford	Own
7.8.08	ME49	Playscheme Visits	Tour around the district	Chauffeur
11.8.08	ME74	Chairman's Own Charity Golf Tournament	Rutland County Golf Club, Stamford	Own
15.8.08	ME69	Malcolm Sargent Play Scheme	Stamford	Own
22.8.08	ME61	Boston Mayor Charity Night	Bicker (Nr Boston)	Chauffeur
23.8.08	ME63	British Model Flying Association Scale Championships	RAF Barkston Heath	Own
24.8.08	ME65	John Hayes MP Hog Roast	At Home	Own
24.8.08	ME72	Olympic Flag Flying Event	Grantham Council Offices	Own



# South Kesteven District Council

Chairman  
Councillor Mike Exton  
01780 751265  
e-mail [m.exton@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:m.exton@southkesteven.gov.uk)



Please contact: Viv Wyatt  
Council Offices, St. Peter's Hill  
Grantham, Lincs, NG31 6PZ  
01476 40 60 07  
e-mail: [v.wyatt@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:v.wyatt@southkesteven.gov.uk)

30 June 2008

The Rt. Hon. Hazel Blears M.P.  
Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
LONDON  
SW1E 5DU

Dear Miss Blears

## **Designation of residential gardens as brown field sites**

At the last meeting of the full council on 19 June, members of South Kesteven District Council debated a motion about the impact that the Government's policy of designating gardens as brown field sites has had on many residential areas. The member submitting the motion had been contacted by many of his constituents who were experiencing stress and a reduction in the enjoyment of their neighbourhood as a result of high density development in close proximity to their homes.

The council voted to support the motion that a letter be sent to you on behalf of its members to express displeasure at this policy. This policy has now opened the door to a surge of planning applications from garden grabbing developers whose actions are slowly destroying the pleasant environments in which many of our citizens live. Residential properties are now seen as prime infill opportunities to the detriment of the character of local communities.

Members were mindful that as a local planning authority, applications must be determined against planning law and policy guidance. However, each application should be determined on its merit, and members were very concerned that this blanket policy places pressure on local planning authorities because of the targets for building and drive for high density housing.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Exton'.

Chairman of the Council

17 July 2008

Councillor Mike Exton  
Chairman of the Council  
South Kesteven District Council  
St. Peter's Hill  
Grantham, Lincs  
NG31 6PZ

Our Ref: HB/16/020865/08  
Your Ref:

Dear Mr. Exton,

Thank you for your letter of 30 June to the Rt Hon Hazel Blears MP on behalf of members of South Kesteven District Council, follow a motion regarding housing development on garden land. Your letter has been passed to me for reply.

As you know, there is considerable need for new housing. The Housing Green Paper '*Homes for the future: more affordable, more sustainable*', published in July last year, outlined the Government's plans for delivering the homes that we need to meet the growing demand for housing and to address affordability issues.

But whilst the Government wants to see more housing, it also wants to see it built in a properly planned and strategic way, and not just at any cost. It is also important to ensure that housing development is in the right place. That includes preventing inappropriate development in residential areas or on garden land where it is not sustainable and other sites are available. I hope you would agree that the changes in policy that were put in place through the publishing of PPS3 in November 2006, do give local authorities like yours more flexibility to shape new development according to the needs of their area and make decisions on what sort of new housing they need and where it should be located. Local authorities can treat residential land differently from other kinds of brownfield land, and are able to place restrictions on development on residential brownfield land through adopting appropriate policies in plans.

Whilst PPS3 does quite rightly prioritise the use of brownfield land for development, one of its overarching objectives is to ensure housing is provided in suitable locations. That is why PPS3 states in clear terms that there is no presumption that land is suitable for housing simply because it is brownfield, stressing the need for sites to be suitable for housing development and that are in suitable locations.



However, this does place an emphasis on being able to identify alternative appropriate sites for development in order to support the additional homes in the most suitable locations. This is where the evidence based, and 'plan-led', approach set out in PPS3 becomes so important. The evidence that local authorities should pull together about need and demand, affordability and sustainability and supply of housing land, needs to be robust and up-to-date to then give them a good basis for making strategic and operational decisions. With local authorities identifying sites in their plans rather than relying upon speculative planning applications coming forward randomly, they can provide housing in suitable locations that will ensure local communities get the right kind of housing in the right place, at the right time, having regard to local needs.

Allied to this is the need for high quality design, which is at the forefront of the policy approach. PPS3 places a much stronger emphasis on the quality of residential design and layout, making clear that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted. Local authorities should also ensure that they develop their own design policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected in their local area. This includes providing for the retention or re-establishment of the biodiversity within residential environments.

I hope this is helpful

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Sofat', with a horizontal line drawn underneath it.

**Sangeeta Sofat**

## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: Interim Corporate Head of Finance

REPORT NO: CHFR116

DATE: 4<sup>th</sup> September 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	Medium Term Financial Plan 2008/09 – 2010/11	
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	Yes	
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	March 2008	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Policy Framework Proposal	
<b>COUNCIL AIMS/ PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr M Spencer-Gregson O.B.E. Assets and Resources Portfolio holder	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Effective Use of Resources	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	None	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	This report is available via the Local Democracy link on the Council's website <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  <b>Yes</b>	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  <b>No</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Report to Cabinet CHFR113 on 11 August 2008	

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) brings together the Council's financial position and demonstrates how the revenue and capital financial resources are organised in order to deliver the Council's priorities.

The Council approved a MTFP for the Council for the five year period 2007/8 to 2011/12 at its meeting on 6 September 2007. The Plan at that time was based on a five year forecast. However given the fact that the grant settlement is for a three year period it is more appropriate for the plan to cover the same time period. However it is necessary to keep the Plan under constant review and provide members with an annual updated Plan each year to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- A) Council approves the revised Medium Term Financial Plan for the period of 2008/09 to 2010/11, as attached.**
- B) Council notes that an annual review of the Plan will be undertaken to reflect the local and national economic climate and emerging issues.**
- C) Council notes, that following publication, an updated Plan will need to take into consideration the findings of the newly revised HRA business forecast model.**

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

Key issues which have been addressed in the updated Plan are:

- Current economic factors
- Current spending pressures
- Sensitivity analysis of uncontrollable expenditure headings
- Government efficiency proposals
- The outturn position for 2007/08
- Opportunities for future income generation
- Details of the three year Government settlement

## Summary of Plan

The long term financial planning of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) will be undertaken to reflect both the updated HRA business plan and the outcome of stock condition survey. Opportunities for securing the long term financial sustainability of both the revenue and capital budget will need to be identified and incorporated into HRA service planning.

The Government has introduced an annual a 3% per annum cashable efficiency target for the public sector commencing in 2008/9 for a three year period. This target is one of the Local Area Agreement targets (NI179) and is 'non-designated' to the Council. However the Council will need to continue to embed its Value for Money (VFM) agenda and other initiatives throughout services in order to ensure resources are utilised efficiently and effectively.

There will be continuing pressure put on those expenditure headings that are classed as 'uncontrollable' i.e. the rise in cost is driven by external economic factors. These will need to be continually managed in order to identify potential budget pressures and options for reducing rising costs should be explored.

Fees and charges income should be kept under close review as this is a key source of the revenue stream for the Council. Key areas such as car parking are coming under threat as a result of other car park providers and changes in car parking behaviour and prudent and robust budgeting in respect of these income headings will need to be managed. At the time of writing the MTFP an updated Fees and Charges Strategy is being compiled to include the recent findings of the Audit Commission publication 'Positively Charged'.

## **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED**

The MTFS needs to be reviewed to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

## **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

My comments are contained within the body of the report.

## **6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

As this strategy is part of the Council's Budget and Policy Framework, it is essential it is reviewed annually to ensure it remains fit for purpose.

**7. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER**

None

**8. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

The MTFP has been reviewed to take account of current economic factors; current spending pressures; the Government's efficiency target agenda; and the three year grant settlement.

**9. CONTACT OFFICER**

Interim Corporate Head of Finance (section 151 officer)

Richard Wyles

[r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk)

01476 406210

## INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section: Financial Services & Risk Management	Names of those undertaking assessment: Richard Wyles	
Name of Policy to be assessed: Medium Term Financial Plan	Date of Assessment: 24 July 2008	Is this a new or existing policy?: Revision to existing strategy
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy: The aim of the plan is to provide a framework for medium term financial planning for the Authority		
2. What are the key performance indicators? The strategy provides key themes which will be monitored		
3. Who will be affected by this policy? All stakeholders		
4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? The MTFP is designed to enable the Authority to deliver on specific service policies which have their own impact assessments		
5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service?  None		
6. What outcomes are required from this strategy and for whom?  The plan provides a financial framework which need to be adhered to in order to provide and maintain robust financial planning		
7. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? External forces specifically the allocation of Government funding		
8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy?  Council tax payers, rent payers, business rate payers, parish councils, partners, other local government partners		
9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? Council is responsible for setting the policy following advice and lead from the s151 officer		
10. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on different racial groups? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?		



No

11. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on men and women? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

12. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on disabled people? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

13. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of sexual orientation? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

14. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of age? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

15. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of religious belief? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

16. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on any other groups of people eg those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgendered or transsexual people. If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?

No

17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access?

No

18. Where do you think improvements could be made?

None identified

19. Are there any unmet needs or requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups. If yes, please give details.

No
20. Is there a complaints system?  Corporate complaints system
21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?  N/a
22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?  N/a
23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?  None
24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view?  N/a
25. Could the differential impact identified in 8 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy?  N/a
26. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy?  N/A
27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?  N/A
28. Should the policy proceed to a full impact assessment?  No
29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by  N/A
Signed (Lead Officer): Richard Wyles .....  Date: 24 July 2008 .....

--

# **SOUTH KESTEVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **3 Year Medium Term Financial Plan** **(2008/09 to 2010/11)**

### **Contents**

**Executive Summary and Key Themes**

**Introduction**

**National & Local Context**

**Key Aims**

**Revenue Budget**

**Capital Budget**

**Housing Revenue Account**

**Reserves & Balances**

**Risk Analysis**

### **Appendices:**

- A 4 Year Revenue Money Plan (incorporating 3 Year forecast)**
- B 4 Year Summary Capital Money Plan (incorporating 3 Year forecast)**
- C 4 Year Summary HRA Money Plan**
- D Schedule of Reserves**
- E Movement in Reserves**
- F Risk Assessment**

## **Executive Summary**

The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) brings together the Council's financial position and demonstrates how the revenue and capital financial resources are organised in order to deliver the Council's priorities. The Plan will be reviewed each year in order to take into account the year end position for the year just ended and to reflect emerging national and local issues that will impact on the medium term financial planning.

At the present time the Council is in a relatively strong financial position and has good financial management arrangements in place. However, these will need to be strengthened in order to respond positively to the challenges presented by the growing economic downturn and increasing demand for service improvements. Revenue and capital resources will need to continue to be carefully targeted at Council priorities. Against this background, the key messages emerging from this plan are:

- Linking with the Corporate Plan, Priority Plans and other key strategies are crucial.
- The national and local context plays an important part in shaping the way the Council manages its resources and money.
- A sustainable and balanced revenue budget will need to be maintained over the period covered by this plan.
- The Government expects to see annual Council Tax increases below 5% and will not hesitate in using its capping powers.
- A sustainable capital strategy will need to be maintained and kept under regular review in order to deliver the Council's capital programme.
- The financial viability of the Housing Revenue Account will need to be carefully managed over the next 3-5 years
- The current and projected level of reserves and balances are sufficient to meet the Council's needs and priorities over the next 3 years but the position will need to be reviewed annually.
- The current approach to setting fees and charges are being reviewed in light of the recent Audit Commission publication entitled "Positively Charged".
- The Council's approach to Value for Money will continue to be embedded across the organisation and will support the ongoing search for efficiency gains and deliver the Government's annual 3% cashable savings target within the LAA (Local Area Agreement).
- It is important to effectively manage the key risks and pressures identified in this plan as an integral part of the Council's corporate risk management process.
- The current economic climate will have a negative impact on the Council's projected investment interest forecast and will

- impact on fixed term contracts linked to inflationary RPI (retail price index), business rates, utility rates and salary forecasts.
- The Council's Asset Management Plan will need to be regularly reviewed in order to ensure the use of assets is maximised and reflects the delivery of the Council's priorities.
  - The Climate Change and energy efficiency agenda will need to be incorporated into service planning and identification of resources needed to deliver this will be necessary.

## **Key Themes**

In order to support the Council's vision and priorities the MTFP is underpinned by a number of key themes:

- 1** The Corporate Plan will be used to drive the allocation of resources. This will ensure that Council priorities are delivered without exposure to unnecessary risks by targeting the use of resources linked to corporate risk. Linkages with other key strategies such as People Strategy, ICT strategy and Treasury Management Strategy are also important.
- 2** The Council's resources (financial and otherwise) are managed effectively to provide efficiency, value for money, customer satisfaction and sustainable investment.
- 3** A sustainable Revenue Budget will be maintained, having regard to prudent estimates of government funding and opportunities for external funding.
- 4** A sustainable Capital Strategy will be maintained to support deliverable medium term capital programmes, having regard to asset utilisation and improved Treasury Management performance.
- 5** The long term financial planning of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) will be undertaken to reflect both the updated HRA business plan and the outcome of the stock condition survey. Opportunities for securing the long term financial sustainability of both the revenue and capital budget will be identified and incorporated into HRA service planning.
- 6** The development and delivery of the annual budget will be supported by Members fully utilising policy development groups and scrutiny and underpinned by regular training. At officer level, the Management Teams will assume collective responsibility and there will be regular consultation with stakeholders and key partners.
- 7** Management processes will increasingly cover zero based and priority based budgeting, invest to save projects, sensitivity analysis of high/low spending areas and benchmarking/use of comparatives.

- 8 The General Fund working balance will continue to be maintained between 10% and 15% of net expenditure. This will provide adequate cover for any unanticipated expenditure or loss of income that may occur over the course of each financial year.
- 9 The Council budget consists of large amounts of uncontrollable costs which are related to both mandatory spending and levels of expenditure not directly under the control of the Council. These spending areas will need to be actively managed in order to ensure the Council can deliver its efficiencies and maintain a balanced budget.

## **Summary of Key Financial Issues**

- Continuing pressure on budget headings that are driven by external economic factors such as:
  - Utility and fuel costs
  - Salary growth
  - Fees and charges income
  - External contracts
  - Business and drainage rates payable by the Authority
- The financial modelling and forecasting of the Housing Revenue Account will need to be fundamentally reviewed to prevent the Account being in a deficit position in the short term.
- Future investment in key services will need to be balanced and clear demonstration of customer improvements will need to be identified.
- The Value for Money (VFM) agenda will need to be embedded throughout the organisation in response to the national grant settlement and the local area VFM target.

## **Introduction**

The ability to deliver and sustain South Kesteven District Council's Vision and Corporate Plan is dependent upon having the required resources to do so. The purpose of this plan is to translate the Council's strategic direction, core values and priority outcomes into financial terms whereupon, good financial management remains key to its delivery.

In recent years, the Council has developed a more strategic forward looking approach to budgeting underpinned by a more robust planning process, demonstrating the direction of resources towards priority services. Accordingly, this updated plan develops this approach and sets out the Medium Term Financial plan for the three year period commencing 2008/09. A three period is in line with the Government's 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR07) and 3 year grant settlements. It also acknowledges that financial forecasting beyond 3 years is difficult due to current adverse economic conditions and the volatility of interest rates and financial markets, etc. The position will be updated annually and will evolve and develop in response to the Council's priorities, national issues and the economic climate.

Against this challenging background, the Council has managed its financial resources prudently over many years and as a result is well placed to continue to deliver local priorities into the future.

The plan consolidates projections and emerging themes for the Council over the three year period. More specifically, in terms of the overarching policy and financial framework, it takes account of each of the following:

- ❖ Corporate Plan
- ❖ Capital Strategy
- ❖ Asset Management Plan
- ❖ Treasury Management Strategy
- ❖ Fees and Charges Strategy
- ❖ ICT Strategy
- ❖ Debt Management Strategy
- ❖ People Strategy
- ❖ Housing Revenue Account Business Plan
- ❖ Efficiency Strategy
- ❖ Financial Regulations
- ❖ The role of key partners and stakeholders in shaping this Plan

This plan has been reviewed to take account of the financial outturn position for 2007/8 and the approved Revenue and Capital Budgets for 2008/09.



## Key Aims

**In summary, the key aims of the MTFP are to:**

- Identify the resources to deliver the Council's strategic priorities - all key decisions of the Council should relate back to the Corporate Plan and other related strategies
- Provide cost effective services, which demonstrate value for money – delivered through an agreed programme of efficiencies.
- Enable the Council to continually improve services through targeted investment to the priorities underpinned by financial prudence.
- Deliver a balanced sustainable budget in the longer term – by ensuring:
  - Opportunities and threats to both deliver priorities and manage the financial position are identified – so the Council always knows what it is facing
  - Expenditure does not exceed income and there is capacity for improvement and investment.
  - Proper and prudent financial parameters are placed on current and future spending plans - to ensure that the Council stays on track
- Continually improve the financial framework in order to provide a basis for sound financial management and control.

## National and Local Context

**Wider context** - the following key elements are relevant to South Kesteven:

- The Government's spending and funding plans for the public sector and local government as set out in CSR07. This covers a 3 year timeline and in terms of Government funding provides greater security for the public sector in the short to medium term.
- Forecast inflation – despite rising costs and the growing risk of recession, the Government's target for inflation measured as the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and public sector pay increase remains at 2%. As at May 2008, the year on year increase in CPI was 3.3% so the Government has accepted that this may not be achieved over the period of the CSR07. Moreover, as at July 2008 many large employers are dealing with pay demands well in excess of the 2% threshold. In addition, many public sector bodies have external contracts where annual price increases are linked to the Retail Price Index (RPI) and these will come under increasing pressure. As a result, the Council will need to carefully review its assumptions about pay and non-pay inflation over the next 3 years.

- Forecast interest rates for borrowing and investment - Interest rates are of particular importance to the Council, in that they affect its performance on investments and borrowing.
- Although no specific guidance has been published the Government expects to see Council Tax increases below 5% in each of the three years of the CSR and this will be reflected in the grant settlement.
- The White Paper, 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' published in 2006 recommended that official recognition be given to the role of authorities in convening local partnerships, with LAAs being put on a statutory footing and a specific duty to cooperate placed on named partners.
- From 2009, Comprehensive Area Assessments (CAA) will replace Comprehensive Performance Assessments (CPA). This marks a significant change to the current assessment regime and will look at the public services in an area delivered by councils and their partners including private and voluntary sectors rather than focussing on services provided by local authorities. More importantly, it also aims to be more relevant to local people by focusing on issues that are important to their community, e.g. crime, community cohesion, a sustainable environment (e.g. climate change and energy efficiency) or public health issues.
- The Housing Green Paper published in July 2007 looks at policy initiatives such as localisation and increased influence of tenants in managing their homes. The paper also cautiously mentions the self-financing option for the HRA and the potential benefits and risks of a wider reform of the current HRA subsidy system.
- A recent white paper 'Communities in control: real people, real power' seeks to give people more say over their lives and in doing so give more power to local people and communities in a number of ways. These range from participatory budgeting, duty to promote democracy, duty to involve (coming into effect April 2009) and asset management/transfer proposals.

**Local context** – against this background, South Kesteven as a growing district and in common with most other authorities will face increasing resource challenges in the coming years and therefore, as an integral part of the budget process, the Council will be required to:

- Continue to improve and strengthen its financial planning and budgeting processes to ensure that the authority is prepared for the reduction, in real terms, of Government funding – 1% increase on average across all authorities compared with CPI and RPI both running in excess of 3%. This may affect the

continued improvement in the delivery of some Council services.

- Deliver savings and efficiencies to maintain reserves and balances at an adequate level and/or cover any projected budget gap that might emerge.
- In terms of delivering Value for Money, ensure that the authority has robust plans in place to meet the 3% per annum annual cashable efficiency savings target. This is an increase on the current regime, where a target of 2.5% has been set, with only half being cashable. There will not be a mandatory value for money target for each individual council, instead, efficiency savings across local government as a whole will be measured and monitored based on local value for money indicators. Targets will only exist where they are negotiated as one of the new LAA targets.
- Strengthen the way the authority operates through partnerships ensuring these work effectively and deliver positive outcomes in line with the revised performance framework for the LAA.
- Keep track of Government plans to continue to mainstream specific grants into Revenue Support Grant and Area Based Grant in order to address the consequences for resource/budget management.
- Review the impact of reduced funding from Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI) scheme over the period of CSR07 and consider the introduction of supplementary business rates for single tier authorities on local funding streams.
- Maximise the opportunity to secure Government and/or external funding to underpin partnership working within the revised LAA arena.
- Capitalise on the benefits of being an active member of the Lincolnshire Shared Services Partnership where the guiding principle of the partnership is one of local choice, but made in the context of maximising efficiency through standardisation of service specification where appropriate, e.g. procurement.
- Maintain flexibility in order to respond to a changing local government environment in response to rapid change, national constraints, new Government regulation and direction, etc.

## **Revenue Budget**

Appendix A shows the 4 year Money Plan, i.e. the movement in budgets and funding over a 4 year period (2007/08 – 2010/11) and includes the outturn for 2007/08 (pre-audit) and the period covered by this plan.

Indicative budgets for the next 3 years are based on the following key assumptions:

## ***Sensitivity Analysis***

Within the revenue budget there are a number of expenditure headings which are influenced by external influences which will have a direct impact on the budget provision for the three year period. These expenditure items can be classified between controllable and uncontrollable. These headings are summarised as:

### Salaries growth forecast

The three year budget forecast has been based on an inflationary increase of 2.5%. An increase of 0.5% will result in an additional £65K per annum (assuming a constant number of FTE's)

### Maintenance Contracts

The grounds maintenance contract is annually increased (in accordance with the contract) in line with Retail Price Index. The budget has been based on annual inflation increase of 3%. An increase of 1% will result in an additional £10K per annum.

### Utilities and Fuel

Currently there is significant growth in costs under both of these headings and the three year budget has been based on a forecast of an average increase of 3.5%. Should this increase to an average maximum of 12% an additional budget of £65K will be necessary.

### Rates

These can be classified between non-domestic rates and drainage rates. In respect of drainage rates the budget forecast is based on an annual increase of 4%. An increase of 1% will result in an additional annual cost of £6K. However in respect of business rates the Council will benefit from the business rate savings in respect of the leisure centres following the implementation of Leisure Trust. This saving has been incorporated into the budget forecast for 2009/10 and 2010/11. The increase in RPI which will affect the business rates payable in respect of other assets which could result in an additional £30K per annum.

### Fees and Charges

Fees and charges represent a significant and important income stream for the Council (£6.3m in 2007/08). At the time of compiling the MTFP the annual forecast in respect of the key areas of fees and charges income is £600K less than the 2008/09 budgeted income. The key areas contributing to the reduced forecast is in respect of car parking income, development control and building control. These areas will need to be closely monitored during the course of the year in order to mitigate the impact of the potential reduction in income.

Heading	2009/10 £'000	2010/11 £'000
Salaries	65	75
Maintenance Contract	10	20
Utilities and Fuel	65	90
Rates	36	50
Reduced Fees and charges income	590	650
Potential total future budget pressure	<u>766</u>	<u>885</u>

The Council has set an indicative budget for the three year period taking into consideration the three year grant settlement and an indicative Council Tax increase. The potential additional cost identified above will therefore need to be found from existing budget expenditure items in order to provide a balanced budget. The Council will not be able to utilise reserves and balances as this will not give longer term financial sustainability.

### ***Council Tax***

A maximum increase of 5% per annum in council tax income has been assumed throughout the 3 year period plus an annual increase of 1.40% in the council tax base, i.e. net increase in the number of properties. As a guide and using 2008/09, every 1% increase in council tax generates an additional £58k for the Council. Accordingly, the table<sup>1</sup> below sets out an indicative budget requirement to be funded from Council Tax (including Parish Precepts).

2007/8 Actual £m	2008/9 Budget £m	2009/10 Estimate £m	2010/11 Estimate £m
6.499	7.072	7.509	7.971
Annual Increase		£437K	£462K

### ***Government Grants***

In January 2008 the Government confirmed the amount of formula grant (Revenue Support and NDR) for SKDC in 2008/09 which had been announced in CSR07. It also specified the grant payable in the next 2 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> Assumes a maximum of 5% tax increase and 1.4% increase in tax base

Final settlement 2007/8 £m	Provisional Settlement 2008/9 £m	Provisional Settlement 2009/10 £m	Provisional Settlement 2010/11 £m
9.626	9.881	10.025	10.147
Annual Increase	255K	144K	122k

This shows a grant increase over the three year period of 1.45% and 1.2% respectively.

As part of CSR07 and the development of the new framework for Local Area Agreements (LAA), the Government has mainstreamed over £4bn of funding into the new *Area Based Grant (ABG)* over the 3 year period. The difference between ABG and formula grant is that ABG is allocated according to specific policy criteria rather than general formulae. For 2008/09, SKDC will receive £26k and in 2009/10 and 2010/11, £49k and £75k respectively.

The authority will continue to receive specific grants, for example in respect of housing benefit administration, concessionary fares, housing and planning delivery (currently awaiting details of allocation) and Local Authority Business Growth Incentive (LABGI). However it is known that there will be no allocation for 2008/09 as the scheme is being recalculated on a reduced amount basis.

### ***Inflation - Pay & Prices***

- A provision of 2.5% per year is included for staff pay increases. The actual amount of increase will depend on the national pay settlement.
- A provision of 3% has been included for non-pay, although for certain budgets, the increase will be less than 3%
- A number of the Council's contractual commitments are linked to the RPI; any significant movement by April of each year will result in an inflationary pressure where this is above 3%, e.g. *energy costs*. As at July 2008, fuel/utility costs are rising sharply (up to 20%) – the impact on contracts for gas and electricity and new contracts will need to be carefully considered

### ***Pensions***

Following a 'Triennial' Review of the Pension Fund as at March 2007, the contribution rate in 2008/09 is 21.2% of payroll. This takes account of the latest actuarial review and the effects of the changes in the pension scheme together with demographic changes. Based on the most recent triennial survey the contribution rates over the period of the MTFP have been assumed to continue at a similar level but will be reviewed at the next triennial revaluation due in March 2010. A pension reserve has been established to cover any significant increase in the contribution rate and one-off costs of early retirements not budgeted elsewhere.

### ***Fees and Charges***

The current Fees and Charges Strategy approved in 2006/07 is being revised and updated to include the findings and recommendations of the recent Audit Commission publication entitled "Positively Charged". In terms of the MTFP and longer term financial planning, whilst prudent assumptions about demand have been made, this is a potentially risky and volatile area that will need to be kept under close scrutiny.

### ***Net Investment Income***

This has been an important source of income for supporting the Council's service expenditure. The Council will continue to maximise income from investments (over £900k in 2007/08), having regard to use of reserves, asset sales, capital programme commitments and the latest economic projections.

The sensitivity of the General Fund to changes in interest rates is linked more markedly to investment rather than to the portfolio of borrowing – longer term borrowing tends to be on fixed rates. As an indication, a change in interest rates of +/- 0.5% would have an estimated impact of approximately £90k in 2008/09. Interest rates assumed within the period of the MTFP are as follows:

	<b>2008/09</b> <b>%</b>	<b>2009/10</b> <b>%</b>	<b>2010/11</b> <b>%</b>
<b>Interest Rate</b>	5.25	5.0	4.75

### ***Debt Management***

The Council is committed to reducing levels of debt and a more proactive approach to debt management and recovery action has been introduced, particularly in relation to aged debts. A Debt Management Policy has been compiled to ensure a consistent approach to debt management across the key income recovery services.

### ***Concessionary Fares***

On 1<sup>st</sup> April 2008 a new national scheme was introduced with pass holders able to travel free of charge on local bus services within England. Each single pass holder journey will be paid for by the district in which the passenger gets on the bus. The Government has allocated additional resources as part of the grant settlement but as this is a new scheme it is not clear whether this will be sufficient to meet the actual costs incurred by the Council. Therefore the position will need to be kept under regular review. The grant award in respect of concessionary fares for the three year period is:

	<b>2008/09 £k</b>	<b>2009/10 £k</b>	<b>2010/11 £k</b>
<b>Grant</b>	379	387	398
<b>Annual Increase</b>		2.1%	2.8%

### ***Staff Turnover/Vacancy Factor***

In line with recent policy, throughout the period covered by this Strategy, a vacancy/turnover rate of between 1.5% and 2% of the overall salary budget has been provided (c£250k per annum).

### ***External Funding Opportunities***

The Council is committed to maximising the opportunity to secure additional Government and/or external funding to meet its corporate plan priorities and objectives. This includes S106 monies; housing and planning delivery grant etc.

### ***Savings and Efficiencies***

In response to the efficiency agenda and to ensure Value for Money is achieved, the Council is developing a robust benchmarking approach which will need to continue to be embedded across the organisation. A Value for Money Strategy was approved by Cabinet in November 2007 and this will support the ongoing search for efficiency gains and deliver the Government's 3% cashable target for CSR07. It will also focus on areas of spending where the Council has real control over budgets.

In light of the potential financial pressures and expenditure constraints, all options will be considered for generating efficiencies from the areas of expenditure which are potentially within the Council's direct control. The options for delivering efficiencies include:

- Lincolnshire Shared Services – the various work-streams should be evaluated to examine the level of efficiencies that may be achieved.
- Income generation/optimisation, e.g. by reviewing the level of fees and charges in non-discretionary areas.
- Business process re-engineering - with a particular emphasis on joined up working and the use of appropriate technology and to create new ways of working in the Council.
- Value for money reviews - to ensure that the limited resources are being used to the best effect, service reviews will be aimed at demonstrating that services are delivering an optimum balance between relatively low costs (economy), high productivity (efficiency), and successful outcomes (effectiveness).
- In-house provided services – the Council provides a number of frontline services together with a number of support services. All services will be benchmarked to evaluate value



for money and identify potential for efficiencies through market testing, where appropriate.

- Overheads – an examination of the Council’s overhead base to establish value for money and opportunities for achieving efficiencies.
- Asset disposal - with a view to generating greater investment income and reducing revenue-running costs (and releasing capital receipts to support the investment programme).
- Budget reviews – by ongoing fundamental budget reviews (including the introduction of zero based budgeting), challenging the allocation of resources based on priority, needs and output delivery and through active budget management.
- Sponsorship options – for example advertising.
- Formal Market Testing – The Council is committed to ensuring its service offer value for money for the customer and has identified services which, over a period of time, will be tested in the market place in terms of value and quality of service provision.

The Council has a successful track record in delivering savings and efficiencies and is committed to continuing to embed the culture of value for money throughout the organisation to ensure that this continues. The savings targets that have been assumed within the MTFP will contribute towards the efficiency target set in respect of the LAA.

## **Capital Budget**

Appendix B sets out the 4 Year Money Plan, i.e. the Capital Programme over a 4 year period (2007/08 – 2010/11) and includes the outturn for 2007/08 (pre-audit) and the period covered by this Strategy. The Programme will be reviewed in September 2008. This needs to be considered in conjunction with the Council’s Corporate Plan and key priorities. Also, the Capital Strategy and Treasury Management Strategy that were reviewed and updated during 2006/07 and fully addresses the new system of capital finance controls set out in the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Code). The Code sets out a framework for self-regulation of capital spending, in effect allowing councils to invest in capital projects without any limit as long as they are affordable, prudent and sustainable. The Code allows the council to determine the appropriate level of capital investment to properly deliver quality public services, subject to affordability.

The Council is committed to enhancing its capital programme and the Prudential Code will be used to ensure the decisions made with regard to borrowing and investment reflect affordability, sustainability and value for money. Where appropriate, external

advisors will again be used to assist in such reviews and this will involve consideration of the following issues:

- Balancing investment income against new borrowing
- Leasing versus buying outright
- Ensuring that the balance of investment between General Fund and Housing Revenue Account is well defined and analysis of the impact of changes of debt and investment structure on both funds.

The revised Capital Strategy sets out the Council's approach to capital investment and has resulted in the development of a medium term capital programme which is reviewed annually to provide a forward 3 year view. All capital schemes are appraised and scored when developing the medium term capital programme, however, it is essential that the process is flexible enough to deal with emerging or urgent schemes. Over the next 3-5 years, the Council will invest significantly in town centre development, disabled facilities grants, waste management and refurbishing/improving the Council's housing stock. Investment in the total programme is c£10m per annum

The capital programme for the General Fund is heavily reliant on useable capital receipts and prudential borrowing to fund the investment required to deliver its main aims and strategic priorities. The balance of funding is covered by capital grants (principally disabled facilities) and direct revenue financing. In the long term this package of investment may not be sustainable and other sources of funding may need to be sought to fund capital expenditure, including maximising the potential of asset sales, i.e. property and land that are not fully utilised or are surplus to requirements. In this connection, the Council has also reviewed its Asset Management Plan alongside the Capital Strategy on the basis of ensuring that financial returns for future investment in Council priorities are optimised for the benefit of the community.

The revenue implications of all capital schemes, including the corresponding reduction in investment income as a result of a reduction in capital resources, additional revenue running costs of any new assets and the cost of any unsupported borrowing have been taken account of and included within the MTFP.

The Capital Strategy will need to be kept under review to ensure it remains 'fit for purpose'. Over the period of the MTFP, more emphasis will be given to Member led capital monitoring in order to ensure that decisions made about capital spending are robust and sustainable for the Council.

### **Housing Revenue Account (HRA)**

The HRA is a statutory ring-fenced account that relates to costs and income in respect of the Council's housing stock. The HRA budget

and rent setting process is undertaken alongside the General Fund and certain elements of the process are carried out simultaneously. Following a ballot of Council House Tenants the Council subsequently decided to retain the Council's Housing Stock and officers have been reviewing the Council's Housing Revenue Account business plan and developing proposals for the HRA's longer term sustainability, including achievement of the decent homes standard.

A review of the HRA and subsidy system has been announced by the Government and a report is expected in spring/summer 2009. In the meantime, it will be necessary to keep the position under review as part of the rolling 30 year business plan for the HRA.

At the time of writing the MTFP the Council is awaiting the updated business forecast model in respect of the HRA which will require the Council to take urgent action in order to ensure the financial stability of the HRA in both the short and medium term. In the interim, the financial viability of the HRA will be managed and maintained within government guidelines, including the target to achieve rent convergence by 2016/17. This will need to take account of the results of the full stock condition survey that will be undertaken during 2008/09.

Appendix C sets out the 4 Year Money Plan, i.e. the HRA over a 4 year period (2007/08 – 2010/11) and includes the outturn for 2007/08 (pre-audit) and the period covered by this Plan. This shows that with on-going deficits of between £1m and £2m per year, the HRA working balance will reduce to £6.9m by March 2011 and the balance on the Major Repairs Reserve will reduce to £475k by March 2011. This position will need to be closely monitored.

## **Reserves and Balances**

The minimum prudent level of reserves that the Council should maintain is a matter of judgement. It is the Council's safety net for unforeseen circumstances and must last the lifetime of the Council unless contributions are made from future year's revenue budgets. CIPFA guidance does not set a statutory minimum level but it is up to local authorities themselves, taking into account all the relevant local circumstances, to make a professional judgement on what the appropriate level of reserves and balances should be.

Reserves can be held for three main purposes:

- A working balance to help cushion the impact of uneven cash flows and avoids unnecessary temporary borrowing – this forms part of general reserves.
- A contingency to cushion the impact of unexpected events or emergencies – this also forms part of general reserves.
- A means of building up funds often referred to as earmarked reserves to meet known or predicted liabilities.

A schedule of reserves and the purposes for which they are held is attached at Appendix D. A review of the level of balances and reserves was undertaken as part of the closure of accounts and preparation of Annual Statement of Accounts for 2007/8 together with a review during the preparation of the budgets for 2008/9.

The total reserves held as at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008 is £28.8m as follows:

General Fund Reserves	£7.5m
Capital Reserves	£7.2m
Housing Revenue Account	£14.1m

Details of the level of reserves and current estimated movements on reserves from 2008/09 are contained in Appendix E. The level of individual reserves has been reviewed to take account of potential future use and particularly those, which are earmarked for specific purposes. A clear policy for the use of each reserve has also been developed.

In summary, the levels of reserves and balances recommended within this plan are believed to be sufficient to meet all of the Council's obligations and have been based on a detailed risk assessment. However, the position will be reviewed annually.

## **Risk Analysis**

Inevitably, there are risks associated with the assumptions for both capital and revenue. In order to mitigate such risks, prudent assumptions have been made where appropriate. It will be necessary to review this Strategy annually to take account of the financial implications of new developments and changing circumstances and the consequential impact on medium and long term financial projections. In year budget monitoring is also crucial and the current approach is being improved and strengthened to include year end forecasting.

The Council is enhancing its approach to managing risk both at a strategic and operational level. Mechanisms are currently in place to manage strategic risks through a regular ongoing review of the Strategic Risk Register by the Management Board. In addition, the service planning incorporates a risk assessment to be completed as part of the service planning process. This is regularly reviewed during the course of the year and quarterly assurance statements are signed off by both Corporate Heads and Service Managers.

There is a need to ensure that the Council is not exposed to unnecessary risks by adopting a policy of targeting the use of resources linked to an assessment of corporate risk and ensuring that appropriate mechanisms are in place to monitor the effectiveness of this approach and ensure that it is being embedded. The mechanisms will include a greater emphasis on risk assessment

in the preparation of requests for resources through the service planning and budget process.

A summary of the key risks and pressures facing the Council is set out in Appendix F. These will managed as an integral part of the Council's core risk management process.

**GENERAL FUND SUMMARY - 4 YEAR MONEY PLAN 2007/8 - 2010/11**

	2007/08 Revised Base	2007/08 Actual	2008/09 Estimate Base	2009/10 Estimate Base	2010/11 Estimate Base
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Corporate and Customer Services	2,422	2,245	2,539	2,457	2,496
Finance and Resources	4,838	4,591	4,305	3,970	4,004
Healthy Environment	6,464	6,409	6,621	6,727	6,886
Partnerships & Organisational Improvement	838	712	932	913	928
Special Expense Areas	646	641	654	681	729
Sustainable Communities	3,307	3,347	3,197	3,243	3,382
Salary Vacancy Factor	0	0	(250)	(250)	(250)
Under/(over) allocation of Support Services	11	(32)	44	38	37
<b>TOTAL SERVICE COSTS</b>	<b>18,526</b>	<b>17,913</b>	<b>18,042</b>	<b>17,779</b>	<b>18,212</b>
Parish Precepts	1,035	1,035	1,253	1,316	1,381
Depreciation Charged to Revenue Accounts	(2,367)	(2,301)	(2,535)	(2,552)	(2,535)
Pension Interest Cost and Expected Return on Pension Assets	200	287	250	250	250
Interest and Investment Income	(944)	(1,210)	(613)	(536)	(400)
Interest Payable	261	267	248	248	332
<b>NET OPERATING EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>16,711</b>	<b>15,991</b>	<b>16,645</b>	<b>16,505</b>	<b>17,240</b>
Movement on Reserves					
-Pension Reserve	(250)	(220)	(250)	(250)	(250)
-Net Movement in General Fund Specific Reserves	(526)	(23)	(287)	(102)	(117)
Amortisation of Deferred Charges	-	(427)	-	-	-
Amortisation of Intangible Assets	-	(15)	-	-	-
Government Grants Deferred	-	454	417	391	184
Financing of Capital Expenditure	420	133	103	642	646
Minimum Revenue Provision	215	215	208	277	344
Revaluation Losses	-	(183)	-	-	-
<b>AMOUNT TO BE MET FROM GOVERNMENT GRANT AND LOCAL TAXPAYERS</b>	<b>16,570</b>	<b>15,925</b>	<b>16,836</b>	<b>17,463</b>	<b>18,047</b>
Council Tax Income	(6,499)	(6,499)	(7,072)	(7,509)	(7,971)
Formula Grant	(9,626)	(9,626)	(9,881)	(10,025)	(10,147)
Council Tax Collection Fund Surplus	(47)	(55)	(55)	(29)	(29)
<b>NET BUDGET (SURPLUS) / DEFICIT</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>(255)</b>	<b>(172)</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>(100)</b>
<b>WORKING BALANCE SUMMARY</b>					
Balance At Beginning of Year	2,824	2,000	2,255	2,427	2,527
(Reduction) / Increase in Working Balance	(398)	255	172	100	100
<b>Balance At End Of Year</b>	<b>2,426</b>	<b>2,255</b>	<b>2,427</b>	<b>2,527</b>	<b>2,627</b>
GF Balance as a % of Net Operating Expenditure - Target Between 10-15%	15%	14%	15%	15%	15%

**CAPITAL PROGRAMME - 4 YEAR MONEY PLAN 2007/08 - 2010/11**

	Description	2007/08 Revised Base £'000	2007/08 Outturn £'000	2008/2009 Estimate Base £'000	2009/2010 Estimate Base £'000	2010/2011 Estimate Base £'000
	<b><u>HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT</u></b>					
1	Stock Improvements	5,665	5,282	7,054	6,071	4,887
2	Demolitions	10	-	25	25	25
3	IT Software	97	44	160	-	-
<b>4</b>	<b>TOTAL - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>5,326</b>	<b>7,239</b>	<b>6,096</b>	<b>4,912</b>
	<b><u>OTHER SERVICES</u></b>					
5	Sustainable Communities	1,601	1,346	2,060	1,550	1,400
6	Healthy Environment	577	551	110	320	60
7	Finance and Resources	2,318	2,114	680	530	530
8	Partnerships and Organisational Improvement	294	149	100	75	60
9	Tenancy Services	110	-	280	110	110
10	Indicative Projects (Not yet evaluated)	-	-	45	790	3,205
<b>11</b>	<b>TOTAL - OTHER SERVICES</b>	<b>4,900</b>	<b>4,160</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>3,375</b>	<b>5,365</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>TOTAL - CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>10,671</b>	<b>9,486</b>	<b>10,514</b>	<b>9,471</b>	<b>10,277</b>
	<b><u>GENERAL FUND FINANCED BY:</u></b>					
13	Supported Borrowing	-	-	-	-	-
14	Unsupported Borrowing	-	-	-	-	2,835
15	Specific Reserve - Capital	2,249	2,249	-	-	-
16	Usable Capital Receipts	1,353	596	2,599	2,475	1,631
17	Capital Grants and Contributions					
	- Wharf Road, Stamford	583	555	-	-	-
	- Langtoft Playing Fields - Tennis Courts	6	6	-	-	-
	Wheelie Bin Enhancements	-	55	-	-	-
	Town Centre Projects (Warners Mill)	-	30	-	-	-
	- Stamford Recreation Ground Secured Funding	-	-	73	-	-
	- Stamford Recreation Ground Unsecured Funding	-	-	37	-	-
	- New Housing Developments Grantham (S106 monies)	-	70	200	-	-
	CCTV Dysart Road Grantham	-	17	-	-	-
	- Disabled Facility Grant	213	359	213	213	213
	- Private Sector Renewal	76	28	-	-	-
18	Direct Revenue Financing					
	- IT Hardware Replacement Programme	-	-	50	45	40
	- Building Control Scanner	20	20	-	-	-
	- LABGI Contribution to Town Centre Development	400	-	-	-	-
	- Contribution from Revenue	-	204	103	642	646
<b>19</b>	<b>TOTAL - GF CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>4,900</b>	<b>4,189</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>3,375</b>	<b>5,365</b>
	<b><u>HRA FINANCED BY:</u></b>					
20	Major Repair Reserve	5,772	5,297	7,239	5,355	3,810
21	Usable Capital Receipts	-	-	-	741	1,102
<b>22</b>	<b>TOTAL - HRA CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>5,297</b>	<b>7,239</b>	<b>6,096</b>	<b>4,912</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>TOTAL - CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>10,672</b>	<b>9,486</b>	<b>10,514</b>	<b>9,471</b>	<b>10,277</b>





## HRA - 4 YEAR MONEY PLAN 2007/08 - 2010/11

	Detail	2007/08 Revised Base £'000	2007/08 Actual £'000	2008/09 Estimate Base £'000	2009/10 Estimate Base £'000	2010/11 Estimate Base £'000
	<b>INCOME</b>					
1	Dwelling Rents	(17,883)	(17,664)	(18,926)	(20,230)	(21,547)
2	Non Dwelling Rents	(255)	(245)	(278)	(289)	(302)
3	Charges for Services and Facilities	(1,239)	(1,140)	(1,288)	(1,338)	(1,389)
4	Other Income	(62)	(127)	(55)	(57)	(59)
<b>5</b>	<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>(19,439)</b>	<b>(19,176)</b>	<b>(20,547)</b>	<b>(21,914)</b>	<b>(23,297)</b>
	<b>EXPENDITURE</b>					
6	Repair and Maintenance	6,100	6,125	7,059	6,322	6,400
7	Supervision and Management - General	3,102	2,739	3,326	3,158	3,230
8	Supervision and Management - Special	2,006	1,837	2,121	2,146	2,284
9	Housing Revenue Account Subsidy	4,700	4,700	5,831	6,528	7,269
10	HRA share of Corporate and Democratic Costs	236	209	200	193	200
11	Depreciation and Impairment of Fixed Assets	4,529	4,366	4,731	4,924	5,126
12	Net loss impact on revaluation of HRA stock	0	9,419	0	0	0
13	Debt Management Expenses	20	28	20	20	20
14	Transfer to General Fund in respect of Rent Rebates	0	221	0	0	0
15	Increased Provision for Bad Debts	0	126	0	0	0
<b>16</b>	<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>20,693</b>	<b>29,770</b>	<b>23,288</b>	<b>23,291</b>	<b>24,529</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>NET COST OF HRA SERVICES</b>	<b>1,254</b>	<b>10,594</b>	<b>2,741</b>	<b>1,377</b>	<b>1,232</b>
18	Interest Payable and Similar Charges	166	177	158	158	211
19	Interest and Investment Income	(1,042)	(819)	(722)	(482)	(397)
20	Return on Pension Assets	0	(75)	0	0	0
21	Net Loss impact on sale of HRA Assets	0	688	0	0	0
<b>22</b>	<b>DEFICIT FOR THE YEAR ON THE HRA</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>10,565</b>	<b>2,177</b>	<b>1,053</b>	<b>1,046</b>
	<b>MOVEMENT ON THE HRA BALANCE</b>					
23	(Deficit) / Surplus for the Year	(378)	(10,565)	(2,177)	(1,053)	(1,046)
24	Net charges made on Retirement Benefits (FRS17)	0	439	0	0	0
25	Employers contributions to Pension Fund	0	(552)	0	0	0
26	Net Loss impact on revaluation of HRA stock	0	9,419	0	0	0
27	Net Loss impact on sale of HRA assets	0	688	0	0	0
28	Transfer from Major Repairs Reserve	1,243	951	2,508	431	0
<b>29</b>	<b>Housing Revenue Account balance at start of Year</b>	<b>7,863</b>	<b>7,863</b>	<b>8,243</b>	<b>8,574</b>	<b>7,952</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>Housing Revenue Account Balance at end of year</b>	<b>8,728</b>	<b>8,243</b>	<b>8,574</b>	<b>7,952</b>	<b>6,906</b>

## Appendix D

### Schedule of Main Reserves

Category of earmarked reserve	Rationale
Insurance Reserve (Revenue)	A high level of 'Self-insurance' is a mechanism used by the Council to reduce external premiums. Sums are held in this earmarked reserve to meet potential and contingent liabilities.
Pension Reserve (Revenue)	<b>Former Employees</b> – This reserve provides for matching added years payments in respect of former employees. The Council does not currently operate a policy for added years and this reserve will reduce over time. <b>Current Employees</b> – This reserve is used to finance the capital costs of early retirement decisions taken by the Council and to help protect the Council from large changes in Council Tax resulting from unanticipated rises in the employer's contribution rate following the triennial valuation
Building Control (Revenue)	Annual surpluses from the chargeable element of Building control activities are set aside in this reserve and it is then used to finance service improvements and offset any future deficits
Capacity building, priority setting and service improvement reserve (Revenue)	This reserve has been created to finance stepped improvements required for delivery of the Council's priority services and support the creation of additional corporate capacity.
SEA (Special Expense Area) Reserve	To ensure that this money is spent entirely for the benefit of the specific area in which it was raised, the Council has set up Reserves to retain any underspend of precepts so that they may be used in future years.
Major Repairs Reserve (Capital)	This is the mechanism whereby the Council is required to account for the resources provided through the Major Repairs Allowance, which is provided through Housing Revenue Account Subsidy and is available to fund capital expenditure on HRA assets.
General Fund (Capital reserve)	This reserve is earmarked to finance the Council's future capital programme
Useable Capital Receipts Reserve	Proceeds of fixed asset sales available to meet future capital investment.
<b>Balances</b>	
Housing Revenue Account (HRA)	The HRA is maintained in accordance with the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 which sets out the framework for "ring-fencing" the HRA. The account has to be self financing and there is a legal prohibition on cross subsidy to or from the General Fund
General Fund	Council has approved the policy of maintaining a General Fund working balance of between 4% to 5% of gross turnover or between 10% - 15% of net expenditure to provide adequate cover for any unanticipated expenditure or loss of income that may occur over the course of the financial year
Collection Fund	The balance on the Collection Fund is available for financing the expenditure of Lincolnshire County Council, Lincolnshire Police Authority and SKDC



**RESERVES STATEMENT**

	Balance as at 31 March 2007 £'000	Transfer to Reserve in year £'000	Transfer from Reserve in year £'000	Balance as at 31 March 2008 £'000	Transfer to Reserve in year £'000	Transfer from Reserve in year £'000	Balance as at 31 March 2009 £'000	Movement on Reserve in year £'000	Balance as at 31 March 2010 £'000	Movement on Reserve in year £'000	Balance as at 31 March 2011 £'000	Movement on Reserve in year £'000
<b>General Fund</b>												
<b>Capital Reserve</b>												
General Fund Capital Reserve	2,249	1,013	(2,249)	1,013	-	-	1,013	-	1,013	-	1,013	-
<b>Revenue Reserves</b>												
Insurance Reserve	500	256	- 256	500	-		500	-	500	-	500	-
Pensions Reserve - Former Employer	392		(66)	326		(65)	261	(65)	196	(65)	131	(65)
- Current Employees	1,502		(21)	1,481			1,481	-	1,481	-	1,481	-
Building Control	276	38	(16)	298		(22)	276	(37)	239	(52)	187	(67)
SEA Reserve	0	16	0	16	0	0	16	0	16	0	16	0
Capacity Building, Priority Setting and Service Improvements	1,557	72	0	1,629		(200)	1,429		1,429		1,429	0
	4,227	382	(359)	4,250	0	(287)	3,963	(102)	3,861	(117)	3,744	(132)
					0							
<b>Working Balance</b>	2,824	619	(1,188)	2,255	172		2,427	100	2,527	100	2,627	100
<b>Total General Fund Reserves</b>	<b>9,300</b>	<b>2,014</b>	<b>(3,796)</b>	<b>7,518</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>(287)</b>	<b>7,403</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>7,401</b>	<b>(17)</b>	<b>7,384</b>	<b>(32)</b>
<b>Net Movement in General Fund Specific Reserves</b>			<b>(1,782)</b>		<b>(115)</b>			<b>(2)</b>		<b>(17)</b>		<b>(32)</b>
<b>Housing Revenue Account(HRA)</b>												
<b>Capital Reserve</b>												
Major Repairs Reserve	7,643	3,477	(5,297)	5,823	3,562	(7,239)	2,146	(1,671)	475	-	475	-
<b>Working Balance</b>												
Housing Revenue Account	7,863	381	0	8,244	331	0	8,575	(622)	7,953	- 1,046	6,907	-
<b>Total HRA Reserves</b>	<b>15,506</b>	<b>3,858</b>	<b>(5,297)</b>	<b>14,067</b>	<b>3,893</b>	<b>(7,239)</b>	<b>10,721</b>	<b>(2,293)</b>	<b>8,428</b>	<b>(1,046)</b>	<b>7,382</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Other Capital Reserves</b>												
Useable Capital Receipts Reserve	4,757	2,443	0	7,200	3,449	(2,599)	8,050	(2,463)	5,587	(1,962)	3,625	0
<b>Total Other Capital Reserves</b>	<b>4,757</b>	<b>2,443</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,200</b>	<b>3,449</b>	<b>(2,599)</b>	<b>8,050</b>	<b>(2,463)</b>	<b>5,587</b>	<b>(1,962)</b>	<b>3,625</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Reserves</b>	<b>29,563</b>	<b>8,315</b>	<b>(9,093)</b>	<b>28,785</b>	<b>7,514</b>	<b>(10,125)</b>	<b>26,174</b>	<b>(4,758)</b>	<b>21,416</b>	<b>(3,025)</b>	<b>18,391</b>	<b>(32)</b>

Balance  
as at  
31 March 2012  
£'000

<u>1,013</u>
500
66
1,481
120
16
<u>1,429</u>
<u>3,612</u>
<u>2,727</u>
<u>7,352</u>

475
<u>6,907</u>
<u>7,382</u>

<u>3,625</u>
<u>3,625</u>

<u>18,359</u>
---------------

## Appendix F

### Summary of Key Risks

	Budget Item	Risk
<b>REVENUE</b>		
1	Pay Awards	Settlements exceed the 2.5 % percentage increase provided for in the budget from 2008/09.
2	Staff Turnover/ Vacancy Factor	Staff turnover/vacancies is less than that budgeted
3	General Inflation, Fuel & Energy Costs	Rising costs exceed budget provision. In view of the difficult economic conditions as at July 2008, this will need to be closely monitored
4	Contractual Commitments	RPI is above the rate assumed in calculating the contractual commitments in the budget
5	Council Tax and Business Rates Income	Failure to achieve collection rate targets
6	Investment Income/ Borrowing Costs	Available cash flow surpluses less than anticipated and/or falling interest rates – flip side is reduced borrowing costs. Needs to be closely monitored given levels of volatility in the financial markets
7	Income from Fees & Charges/ Rents:	Reduction in the usage of the service/activity levels, e.g. car parks, local land charges, planning fees, commercial rents
8	Leisure Trust	Impact of new contract on costs, performance, etc
9	Refuse Collection/Recycli ng/ Street Cleansing	The increase in property numbers and development of the Town results in additional costs pressures that have not been built into the budget
10	Concessionary Fares	Service is demand led - implications of new national statutory scheme – operators show a significant increase in usage and therefore costs for reimbursement.
11	Housing Benefits/Subsidy	Increase in payments that do not attract 100% subsidy i.e. overpayments and local authority errors; failure to comply with complex legislative requirements; and lack of audit trail to substantiate grant claim
12	Pensions	Insufficient allowance for pension costs increase + impact of next actuarial review in 2010/11
13	Repairs & Maintenance on Corporate Properties	Unplanned emergency maintenance is required on the Council's Corporate Properties
14	Bad Debt Provision	The Council's existing Bad Debt provision proves insufficient to meet any increase in the value of debts written off
15	White Paper- Strong & Prosperous Communities	Important financial issues include proposals relating to communities, neighbourhoods and place shaping and impact of the new performance management framework
16	General Fund Efficiency Savings Target	The annual 3% cashable efficiency savings target for the period 2008/09 – 2012/13 is not achieved

17	CSR07/Lyons Inquiry & Government Grants /Partnership Funding	Future changes to Local Government Finance resulting in grant reduction from 2011/12 (following current 3 year settlement). MTFP makes assumptions about HPDG and LABGI that may change
18	Council Tax Capping	Council Tax is capped below 5% resulting in re-billing costs, etc
19	Emergency Planning	Emergencies occur, e.g. floods incurring unplanned expenditure for the Council
20	ICT Strategy – Ongoing Change Programme	Growth in new technology resulting in regular upgrades & new /revised systems. May impact on invest to save projects
21	Housing Rents and Property Voids	More Council House disposals than anticipated and Governments revisions to their rent restructuring policy that have a detrimental effect on the Council's budget
22	HRA Repairs and Maintenance Costs	Assumed reductions in repairs and maintenance costs as a result of significant investment in the Council Housing Stock do not materialise
23	Housing Revenue Account Subsidy	Central Government revise the Subsidy rules
24	Value Added Tax (VAT)	Expenditure incurred by the Council on exempt VAT activities causes the 5% partial exemption allowances to be breached. Also the impact of the court judgement on the treatment of VAT on car parking income
25	Reserves & Balances	These fall below a sustainable level having regard to changing needs and priorities
<b>CAPITAL</b>		
26	External Funding	Loss of anticipated external resources to support the capital programme
27	Capital Expenditure	Slippage in the project; increased project costs; and failure of contractor i.e. contractor goes into liquidation
28	Capital Receipts	Shortfall in the actual amount of Capital Receipts (i.e. Council House Sales, other HRA assets, GF assets) against the targets set within the Capital Programme
29	Improvement Grants	Excessive demands for improvement grants
30	Government Funding – Supported Borrowing, Major Repairs Allowances	Central Government reduce funding for Supported Borrowing and Major Repairs Allowance below the levels that have been included in the HIP

## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: PORTFOLIO HOLDER – FINANCE AND ASSETS

REPORT NO.: CHFR117

DATE: 4<sup>TH</sup> September 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>REVISION OF THE CAPITAL PROGRAMME FOR 2008/09</b>
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	YES
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	March 2008
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Budget Policy Framework

<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr M Spencer-Gregson O.B.E.	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Effective Use of Resources	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	None	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	This report is publicly available on the Council's web site <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a> via the local democracy link	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  <b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  <b>No</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	CHFR91 Budget setting report 2008/09	



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The Council approved the capital programme for 2008/09 to 2010/11 at the budget setting meeting on 3 March 2008. As part of ensuring good financial planning a review of the capital programme is necessary to ensure it remains up to date and fully reflects the Council's spending programme.

This report represents a complete review of the capital programme for 2008/09. The housing capital programme for 2008/09 has been reviewed in light of current and up coming contractual commitments for completing work on the Council's housing stock in the remaining part of 2008/09. The general fund has also been reviewed to reflect slippage from the 2007/08 programme and new additional projects that have been scored by the Capital Assets and Management Group.

Currently there has been no amendment to the general fund or housing capital programme for future years. The Capital Asset Management Group has completed scoring of capital bids in accordance with the Council's capital scoring matrix. A full review of the capital programme for the financial year 2009/10 and the future years to 2011/12 will be undertaken at the time of setting the budget; this will be presented to Council in March 2009.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that Council:

- Approve the revised housing capital programme as attached at appendix A.
- Approve the revised General Fund programme as attached at appendix B.
- Approve the revised Summary Financing Statement as shown at appendix C.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

### **HOUSING CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

The revised housing capital programme is attached at appendix A. The programme for 2008/09 has been reviewed to take account of the expected outturn position. This includes: current officer and contractor capacity available to deliver the 2008/09 capital programme; programme slippage from 2007/08 into 2008/09; and the most to up date costing information.

The projected outturn for the housing capital programme is now revised to £7.512m to be completed in 2008/09. This is an overall increase in budget of £561k. This is made up of a number of under and over spends on the different projects underway.

The budget has been increased in the following areas:

- Upgrading sheltered housing scheme – delay in commencing contract resulting in programme slippage into 2008/09 of £50k
- Structural repairs – programme slippage into 2008/09 of £20k
- Re-roofing – programme slippage into 2008/09 of £14k
- Re-wiring – programme slippage into 2008/09 of £118k
- Kitchen and Bathroom refurbishments – an under spend of £167k has been carried forward into 2008/09 although there has been an overall programme reduction amounting to £449K. Therefore the forecasted outturn for this scheme is £3.987m.

- An additional amount of £300k in respect of DDA (Disability Discrimination Act) and fire assessment work in respect of sheltered housing complexes with communal facilities
- Total repairs module slippage of £42k
- Total Mobile module slippage of £11k

## GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME

The revised General Fund capital programme is attached at appendix B. The programme for 2008/09 has been increased by £534k to £4.254m. The slippage from the 2007/08 programme is identified as:

- Stamford Gateway grant contribution – discussions are being held in order to finalise agreement for the release of the final payment. The balance of £80k has been moved into the 2008/09 programme.
- Economic grant Northfields Market Deeping – The Council has agreed a grant of £160k towards the development of Northfields Market Deeping. Due to ongoing works to the pumping station a sum of £125k will slip into 2008/09.
- Disabled Facilities Grant a variance of £81k under spend against programme.
- Cemetery works (phase 2 and 3) – due to a delay in the commencement of the works an amount of £68k has slipped into 2008/09
- Service transformation programme – due to delays in the delivery of the modernisation programme a sum of £172k has slipped into 2008/09. This amount will be spent in accordance with the non-key decision report POI007 (5 November 2007)
- Within the heading 'provision for existing assets' the following schemes have been identified for the current year:

Provision of new Guildhall Arts Centre seating for theatre	£15,000
Stone wall repairs to rear of Council Offices Grantham	£25,000
Carriageway reconstruction and resurfacing works at Alma Park Industrial Estate Grantham (unadopted roadway)	£190,000
Car park reconstruction and stone wall repairs at Stamford Arts Centre	£40,000

All of the items have been identified from the Asset Management Plan and have been identified as a priority in order to mitigate further additional cost to the Authority.

A number of inspections have been carried out to determine the condition of the highway at both Ruston Road and Isaac Newton Way (Alma Park Industrial Estate). The general condition of the carriageway at Ruston Road is fair with certain areas showing only minor signs of distress. However at Isaac Newton Way, both carriageway and footpaths are in a poor condition which has necessitated the proposed expenditure.

- Expansion of green waste collection service – the procurement of a further two vehicles has been brought forward from the 2009/10 financial year to the 2008/09 financial year. The budget provision has been increased from £260K to £300K to reflect the current market cost and to allow flexibility in respect of the type of waste vehicle to be procured.

It is proposed to fund the slippage from the Major Repairs Reserve in respect of the HRA and the usable capital receipts reserve in respect of the General Fund. This funding proposal is in accordance with CHFR91 Budget report approved by Council on 3 March 2008.

#### **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED**

None

#### **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

My comments are contained within the body of the report.

#### **6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

As part of the budget policy framework it is essential the recommendation for review of the capital programme is approved by full Council.

#### **7. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER**

None

#### **8. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

This report has provided members with an update on the progress of the delivery of the Capital Programme for 2008/09 and has also identified for approval some amendments to the programme to take account of the outturn position for 2007/08 and the current officer and contractor capacity to deliver the programme by the end of the financial year.

#### **9. CONTACT OFFICER**

**Richard Wyles**  
**Interim Corporate Head and Section 151 officer**  
**01476 406210**  
**[r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk)**

# CAPITAL PROGRAMMES

Appendix A

## HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME

	Description	2008/2009 Estimate Base £'000	2008/2009 07/08 Outturn Slippage £'000	2008/2009 Revised Base £'000	2009/2010 Estimate Base £'000	2010/2011 Estimate Base £'000
	<b><u>HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT</u></b>					
	<b>Tenancy Services</b>					
	<b>Repairs and Improvements</b>					
1	Upgrading Sheltered Housing Scheme	250	50	300	-	-
2	Structural Repairs	220	20	240	200	200
3	Passenger Lifts, Supported Housing Schemes	120	-	120	180	-
	<b>Energy Efficiency Initiatives:</b>					
4	Windows	260	-	260	252	229
5	Central Heating	620	-	620	567	350
6	Heating and Ventilation			-		
7	Insulation		-	-	-	1,097
	<b>Refurbishment and Improvement:</b>					
8	Miscellaneous Residual Properties	141	-	141	145	160
9	Re-roofing	574	14	588	566	458
10	Re-wiring	208	118	326	214	458
11	Kitchen & Bathroom Refurbishments	4,269	-	3,987	3,655	1,644
12	Communal Doors	160	-	160	92	91
13	DDA compliance and fire risk assessment work	-	-	300	-	-
14	Disabled Adaptations	232	-	232	200	200
		7,054	202	7,274	6,071	4,887
	<b>Demolition Works</b>					
15	Garages	25	-	25	25	25
		25	-	25	25	25
	<b>IT Software</b>					
16	Total Repairs Module	-	42	42	-	-
17	Mobilisation of Craft Working	160	11	171	-	-
		160	53	213	-	-
18	<b>TOTAL - HOUSING INVESTMENT PROGRAMME</b>	7,239	255	7,512	6,096	4,912

# **CAPITAL PROGRAMMES**

Appendix B

## **OTHER SERVICES**

	Description	2008/2009 Estimate Base £'000	2007/2008 Slippage £'000	2008/2009 Revised Base £'000	2009/2010 Estimate Base £'000	2010/2011 Estimate Base £'000
	<b>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES</b>					
	Town Centre Development					
1	Town Centre Projects - Bourne Core Area	370	-	370	170	120
2	Town Centre Projects - Bourne Core Area (Consultancy/Advice)	30	-	30	30	30
3	Town Centre Projects - Unallocated/Provision	750	-	750	750	750
4	Stamford Recreation Ground Improvement Programme	110	-	110	-	-
	Capital Grant			-		
5	Stamford Gateway	-	80	80	-	-
6	Economic Grant - Northfields Market Deeping	-	125	125	-	-
				-		
7	New Housing Developments Grantham (use of S106 monies)	200	-	200	-	-
8	Private Sector Renewal	100	-	100	100	100
9	Regional Housing Grant	-	-	490		
10	Disabled Facilities Grant	500	81	581	500	400
		2,060	286	2,836	1,550	1,400
	<b>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</b>					
	Waste Management					
11	Expansion of Green Waste Collection Service - 2 Freighters	-	-	300	-	-
12	Expansion of Green Waste Collection Service - Wheeled Bins	50	-	50	-	-
	Purchase of Vehicles			-		
13	Purchase of Pool Vehicles	60	-	60	60	60
		110	-	410	60	60
	<b>FINANCE AND RESOURCES</b>					
	Car Parking					
14	Car Parking Provision	30	-	30	30	30
15	Restatement Works at Grantham Canal (Phase 1)	-	-	-	-	-
16	Restatement Works at Grantham Canal (Phase 2)	150	-	150	-	-
	Provision for Existing Assets			-		
17	Windows, Council Offices, Grantham (Phase 2)	100	-	100	-	-
18	Cemetery Works (Phase 2 and 3)	100	68	168	-	-
19	Automatic Monitoring for Utilities	30	-	30	-	-
20	Guildhall Arts Centre seating replacement			15		
21	Stone wall repair Council Offices Grantham			25		
22	Alma Park Road Grantham surface improvements			190		
23	Stamford Arts Centre - car park and stone wall repairs			40		
24	Provision	270	-		500	500
		680	68	748	530	530
	<b>PARTNERSHIPS AND ORGANISATIONAL IMPROVEMENT</b>					
25	Customer Services - Access to Self-Service Facilities	-	-	-	30	20
26	Website Content Management Software	50	-	50	-	-
27	Service Transformation Programme (formerly Modernisation)	-	172	172	-	-
28	IT Hardware Replacement Programme	50	-	50	45	40
		100	172	272	75	60
	<b>TENANCY SERVICES</b>					
	Purchase of Vehicles					
29	Care Services	30	-	30	30	30
30	Housing Maintenance	80	-	80	80	80
31	Lifeline Equipment	170	-	170	-	-
		280	-	280	110	110
32	<b>TOTAL APPROVED - OTHER SERVICES</b>	<b>3,230</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>4,546</b>	<b>2,325</b>	<b>2,160</b>

**CAPITAL PROGRAMMES**

Appendix B

**OTHER SERVICES**

	Description	2008/2009 Estimate Base £'000	2008/2009 Total Base £'000	2009/2010 Estimate Base £'000	2010/2011 Estimate Base £'000
	<b>INDICATIVE PROJECTS (NOT YET EVALUATED)</b>				
	<b>PARTNERSHIPS AND ORGANISATIONAL IMPROVEMENT</b>				
33	Replacement/Renewal of CCTV Equipment	-	-	40	-
34	Service Transformation Programme (Area Office Improvement Work)	-	-	180	30
	<b>HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT</b>				
35	Replacement of Street Scene Fleet	-	-	-	3,000
	<b>FINANCE AND RESOURCES</b>				
36	Alma Park Adoption	-	-	300	-
37	Lift Installation - Main Council Sites	-	-	-	150
38	Car Parking St Leonard's Street, Stamford	-	-	20	-
39	Provision for Existing Assets Arts Centre Refurbishments - Stamford	45	-	45	-
40	Grantham Bus Station - Refurbishment	-	-	-	25
41	Heating Works, Council Offices, Grantham	-	-	250	-
42	<b>INDICATIVE PROJECTS (NOT YET EVALUATED)</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>3,205</b>
43	<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>4,591</b>	<b>5,365</b>

**SUMMARY FINANCING STATEMENT**

	Description	2008/2009 Estimate Base £'000	2008/2009 07/08 Outturn Slippage £'000	2008/2009 Revised Base £'000	2009/2010 Estimate Base £'000	2010/2011 Estimate Base £'000
	<b><u>HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT</u></b>					
1	Stock Improvements	7,054	202	7,274	6,071	4,887
2	Demolitions	25	-	25	25	25
3	IT Software	160	53	213	-	-
4	<b>TOTAL - HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT</b>	7,239	255	7,512	6,096	4,912
	<b><u>OTHER SERVICES</u></b>					
5	Sustainable Communities	2,060	286	2,836	1,550	1,400
6	Healthy Environment	110	-	410	60	60
7	Finance and Resources	680	68	748	530	530
8	Partnerships and Organisational Improvement	100	172	272	75	60
9	Tenancy Services	280	-	280	110	110
10	Indicative Projects (Not yet evaluated)	45	-	45	790	3,205
11	<b>TOTAL - OTHER SERVICES</b>	3,275	526	4,591	3,115	5,365
12	<b>TOTAL - CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	10,514	781	12,103	9,211	10,277
	<b><u>GENERAL FUND FINANCED BY:</u></b>					
13	Supported Borrowing	-	-	-	-	-
14	Unsupported Borrowing	-	-	-	-	2,835
15	Specific Reserve - Capital	-	-	-	-	-
16	Usable Capital Receipts	2,599	3,125	3,425	2,475	1,631
17	Capital Grants and Contributions					
	- Wharf Road, Stamford					
	- Langtoft Playing Fields - Tennis Courts					
	- Stamford Recreation Ground Secured Funding	73	73	73	-	-
	- Stamford Recreation Ground Unsecured Funding	37	37	37	-	-
	- New Housing Developments Grantham (S106 monies)	200	200	200	-	-
	- Disabled Facility Grant	213	213	213	213	213
	- Private Sector Renewal	-	-	-	-	-
	- Regional Housing Grant	-	-	490	-	-
18	Direct Revenue Financing					
	- IT Hardware Replacement Programme	50	50	50	45	40
	- Building Control Scanner	-	-	-	-	-
	- LABGI Contribution to Town Centre Development	-	-	-	-	-
	- Contribution from Revenue	103	103	103	642	646
19	<b>TOTAL - GF CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	3,275	3,801	4,591	3,375	5,365
	<b><u>HRA FINANCED BY:</u></b>					
20	Major Repair Reserve	7,239	7,512	7,512	5,355	3,810
21	Usable Capital Receipts				741	1,102
22	<b>TOTAL - HRA CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	7,239	7,512	7,512	6,096	4,912
23	<b>TOTAL - CAPITAL PROGRAMME</b>	10,514	11,313	12,103	9,471	10,277

## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: INTERIM CORPORATE HEAD (SECTION 151 OFFICER)

REPORT NO.: CHFR118

DATE: 4<sup>TH</sup> September 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF CAR PARKING CHARGES IN BOURNE</b>
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	YES
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	15 <sup>th</sup> August 2008
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Budget Policy Framework

<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr M Spencer-Gregson O.B.E. Finance and Assets Portfolio Holder	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Effective Use of Resources	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	None	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	This report is publicly available on the Council's web site <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a> via the local democracy link	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  <b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  <b>No</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	DPM228, DPM241, CHFR91	



## 1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents the business case for the consideration of the introduction of car parking charges in respect of the Council car parks located in Bourne including the financial evaluation of the set-up costs and projected running costs. It seeks the approval of a supplementary estimate for 2008/09 necessary for the parking order and consultation process to commence plus the costs associated with the infrastructure work that will be required to be carried out prior to the introduction of charges from 1 April 2009. The spending of this supplementary estimate in respect of the infrastructure costs will not be incurred until the Council has considered any objections as a result of the consultation process.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that Council:

- Consider and approve the introduction of the car parking charging policy in respect of Bourne Council operated car parks
- Approve the supplementary estimate of £120K for 2008/09 in respect of the costs associated with the introduction of car parking charges. The spending of the supplementary estimate will only be carried out after the decision to proceed following the consultation process
- Consider and agree the most appropriate charging tariff to be introduced from 1 April 2009 (and reviewed every two years thereafter) which will be subject to consultation in accordance with the Road Traffic Act 1984.
- Approve the commencement of the procedure for the making of a new Off-Street Parking Order for Bourne (which will be subject to consultation in accordance with the Road Traffic Act 1984)

## 3. DETAILS OF REPORT

### Background

This matter has been debated on a number of occasions in recent years and in February 2004 the following Cabinet decision was made:

**‘That the Cabinet recommends that the Council agrees to the new policy of introducing car parking charges in Bourne and that survey work to investigate and capture user behaviour be undertaken at the earliest opportunity if deemed necessary’.**

Report DPM 241 was presented to Cabinet on 5 April 2004 which sought the approval of additional expenditure to enable the infrastructure to be introduced in Bourne car parks. The following decision was made:

**The Council be recommended to approve a supplementary estimate to the 2004/05 Budget in order to facilitate the necessary infrastructure work required to implement a car park charging regime in Bourne.**

This subject was then debated by Council on 29 April 2004 when the following decision was agreed:

**‘To defer the supplementary estimate for infrastructure provision within the car parks in Bourne until Bourne is on a par with other towns within the care of South Kesteven’**

### **Bourne Core Area**

The largest and most utilised Council car park in Bourne is Burghley Street which is mainly used as a shoppers car park. Whilst the proposal within the report is to introduce car parking charges at this car park, the site is included within the Bourne Core Area redevelopment project. Therefore should the development project proceed then there will be abortive costs associated with the removal of the charging infrastructure. It is for this reason that the business case proposal does not include the full costs associated with achieving ‘Park Mark’ standard for Burghley Street but only includes the costs of introducing ‘pay and display’.

### **Business Case**

It is not a statutory requirement to provide car parking services. It is a discretionary service that this Council has always provided as it recognises that car parks are an integral part of any towns’ economic viability. Car parking supports business, leisure and community activity within each town.

The Council also has discretion on whether to charge users for making use of the car parks. If charges are not levied then all costs associated with providing the service fall onto the general tax payers of the district. For 2007/08 the cost of the Bourne car parking service was £21,800. At the present time the Council charges at its car parks in Grantham and Stamford but does not charge at Market Deeping or Bourne. The Council only owns one car park in Market Deeping which is situated some distance from the centre and so there is not a strong business case for proposing a charging regime.

Car park charges are also a management tool to ensure car park spaces are used in the most efficient way to maximise their effectiveness. An example of this is having short stay charging rates for car parks that are located within the centre of town to encourage a high turnover of spaces and thereby discourage all day parkers which otherwise would monopolise the spaces. Without charges on car parks such as these could be detrimental to the economic performance of the town. In addition charging can be a positive tool to assist traffic management in the town by routing traffic to the desired locations thus reducing unnecessary cross-town movements.

## Financial Evaluation

- **Investment required to bring the car parks in Bourne (excluding Burghley Street) up to “Park Mark” standard**

The Interim Corporate Head (Assets and Facilities) has produced estimates of the investment required to bring the car parks in Bourne up to “Park Mark” standard. The capital investment includes: Pay and Display Machines; Lighting upgrade; Drainage and Surface Dressing works; and CCTV.

	Burghley Street £k	South Street £k	Market Square £k	Total £k
Capital Investment	25.00*	70.00	15.00	110.00

\*This amount is in respect of pay and display machines, lighting and re-lining only

A further amount of £10K will be required in respect of the work necessary for the Parking Order.

- **Income generation potential**

The Interim Corporate Head (Assets and Facilities) and the s151 officer have identified the potential for income generation and calculated a payback period based on the above level of investment.

For the purposes of the calculations the following assumptions have been made:

- South Street Car Park to be designated long stay
- Market Square and Burghley Street to be designated short stay
- **Usage assumptions based on similar sized car parks at Grantham and Stamford have been taken and discounted by 50% in order to reflect the anticipated usage of the Bourne car parks following the introduction of charges. The discount also reflects the availability of free parking close to the town centre which could be utilised by the displaced current car park users if charging were introduced.**

**For comparison purposes (based on 2007/08)**

**Watergate car park Grantham annual users 100,674 (100 spaces)**

**Guildhall St Grantham annual users 125,873 (93 spaces)**

**Bath Row Stamford annual users 73,848 (94 spaces)**

**Scotgate Stamford annual users 58,440 (65 spaces)**

**The income figures below have been calculated on the basis of:**

**Burghley Street 52,000 users (100 spaces)**

**South Street 26,000 users (66 spaces)**

**Market Square 25,000 users (50 spaces)**

**It must be stated that no detailed on-site analysis has been undertaken in respect of user behaviour at the car park sites and therefore the usage predictions are hypothetical based on certain assumptions (stated above). It is important members are aware that if the predicted usage is not achieved then the payback period given in this report will not be accurate.**

**Sensitivity analysis has been carried out in respect of the predicted payback to identify a range of payback scenarios. Therefore should the proposal to introduce car parking charges proceed then the payback period would need to be regularly reviewed.**

- Option 1 based on the current tariffs for Grantham and Stamford car parks
- Option 2 based on comparable tariffs in neighbouring towns in South Holland
- Option 3 based on comparable tariffs in neighbouring towns in North Kesteven
- Option 4 based on a discounted 50% figure of the current charges operating in Grantham and Stamford

The following table identifies the income generation potential from each of the 3 charging options together with the potential payback period. Sensitivity has also been calculated based on -5%, -10% and -20% of the net surplus.

	<b>Option 1 £</b>	<b>Option 2 £</b>	<b>Option 3 £</b>	<b>Option 4</b>
Annual Running costs*	56,200	56,200	56,200	56,200
Annual Income	139,780	70,167	102,230	70,986
<b>Annual surplus</b>	<b>83,580</b>	<b>13,967</b>	<b>46,030</b>	<b>14,786</b>
<b>Payback based on total investment of £120,000</b>	<b>1.4 years</b>	<b>8.4 years</b>	<b>2.6 years</b>	<b>8.1 years</b>
Payback based on -5% sensitivity	1.5 years	8.9 years	2.7 years	8.4 years
Payback based on -10% sensitivity	1.6 years	9.4 years	2.9 years	8.9 years
Payback based on -20% sensitivity	1.7 years	10.6 years	3.2 years	10.1 years

\*running costs include attendant salary, business rates, electricity, pay and display tickets and management support.

The charging options used above are set out below:

	<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>	<b>Option 4</b>
<b>Short Stay</b>				
Up to 1 hour	80p	50p	Free	40p
Up to 2 hours	£1.30	70p	£1.00	70p
Up to 3 hours	£1.80	£1.00	£1.00	90p
Up to 4 hours	£6.00	£1.20	£3.00	£3.00
All Day	£8.00	£1.40	£3.00	£4.00
<b>Long Stay</b>				
All Day	£2.60	£1.20	£3.00	£1.30

## **Summary**

It can be seen that based on the estimated level of investment required and the assumptions for annual running costs and income, that the payback period ranges between 16 months to over 10 years dependent upon the charging option applied and upon the level of sensitivity in the income assumptions. The payback period has been calculated assuming no increase in car parking charges over the stated period. Therefore any increase in future charges may have an impact on the projected payback period.

Based on the above calculations and in order to ensure the Council's achieves the shortest payback period of the return for capital investment employed, option 1 is the preferred tariff structure.

## **Market Square Issues**

Members will be aware that Market Square is fully utilised for the traditional town market each Thursday (and a smaller market on Saturdays). Therefore this car park will not be available for paid parking on these days. A further area for consideration is in respect of the users of the Corn Exchange facility and whether users should be expected to pay for parking or exempt (for the purposes of the business case it is assumed no exemption will apply).

## **Availability of alternative Parking**

Members will be aware that there is a large number of free on-street parking close to and within walking distance of the town centre. It is difficult to accurately predict the change in user behaviour of the Council car parks if paid parking is introduced but clearly there will be some loss of current users who will seek alternative free parking. The extent of this 'loss' will affect the income generation proposals. A shorter term issue is the current availability of the former 'Budgens' car park for all day free parking. This will seriously affect the viability of the Market Square car parking operation.

## **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED**

### **Alternative way forward for the proposal**

There is a high level of uncertainty surrounding the proposal due to a lack of actual user information and behaviour patterns and the impact the proposal could have on displacing vehicles on the surrounding town centre. An alternative way forward is for Council to refer the matter to a Policy Development Group for the subject to be considered in detail. In any event the proposal is for the results of the consultation process to be presented and considered in the first instance by a Policy Development Group.

## **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

My comments are contained within the body of the report. However it is important members are aware that the financial evaluation undertaken in respect of this proposal has been prepared based on a number of assumptions (stated in the report). Therefore should the actual usage and behaviour patterns vary from the assumptions made then the payback and viability of the proposal will be affected. If the proposal proceeds to implementation then a robust monitoring process should be implemented in order to regularly review the financial viability of the service.

## **6. COMMENTS OF THE DEPUTY MONITORING OFFICER**

As part of the budget policy framework it is essential that the recommendation for review of the capital programme is approved by full Council.

Section 35 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) England and Wales) Regulations 1996 provides the procedure to be adopted when introducing a new off street Parking Order. The following sets out the procedure to be adopted in light of the Council's own decision making processes:

1. As noted above part of the budget policy framework it is essential the recommendation for review of the capital programme is approved by full council. Consequently, in the first instance Full Council is to give permission to:
  - i) Introduce charging for off street parking at those sites identified in the report;
  - ii) Commence the procedure for the making of a new off street Parking Order;
  - iii) Draft an Order.
2. Thereafter, the Council must consult with relevant statutory authorities on the draft Order. Once the statutory consultees have approved the draft Order a Notice must be placed in the local press, all car parks concerned and on notice boards in Customer Services of all Council offices. The Notice must be placed for a period of 21 days.
3. The right to lodge an objection runs during this 21 day period.
4. At same time as publishing the Notice, the Council must place a copy of the draft Order on deposit for 6 weeks in all Council offices. Stipulate on Notice the times and days that the Order is available for inspection.
5. After the time for objections has passed, the matter needs to be placed back before the resources PDG and Cabinet to consider all objections and decide whether to recommend the making of the Order.
6. Thereafter Cabinet may bring the matter back to full Council with recommendation to either:
  - a) approve the Order as drafted; or
  - b) to amend the Order in light of objections and to approve an amended version.

7. If the Order is subsequently approved by full Council a copy must be placed on deposit. If it is different to the Draft Order, a copy of the draft must be placed with it.
8. Within 14 days of the Order being made (by full Council) a Notice must be placed in the local press for Bourne and in the car parks concerned. The Notice must be in a similar form to the Notice to inform of the intention of making a new Order. In particular it must also state that the Order has been made and contain the following particulars, which the original Notice did not:
  - a. date the Order came or comes into force;
  - b. state, if any person wishes to question the validity of the Order or of any of its provisions on the grounds that it or they are not within the powers conferred by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 or that any requirements under the Act or of any instrument made under the Act has not been complied with and that a person may within 6 weeks from the date the Order is made apply for the purpose to the High Court.
9. Finally, in the event the Order is approved, the Council must write to objectors to inform them that the Order made and when comes into effect

## **7. COMMENTS OF INTERIM CORPORATE HEAD (ASSET & FACILITIES)**

I have been fully involved in the preparation of the business case in respect of Bourne car parking charges. The Asset Management Plan illustrates the importance of maximising our utilisation of assets and the business case details alternative pay back periods to cover the initial investment required in instigating charges at the various car parks in the town. Ultimately fees recovered can be invested in the planned maintenance of these important assets. Operational issues will be somewhat restrictive at the Market Square due to the Thursday & Saturday markets, the Corn Exchange usage and the current plethora of alternative free space within the immediate location.

## **9. CONTACT OFFICERS**

**Richard Wyles**  
Interim Corporate Head and Section 151 officer  
01476 406210  
[r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:r.wyles@southkesteven.gov.uk)

**Paul Stokes**  
Interim Corporate Head  
01476 406410  
[p.stokes@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:p.stokes@southkesteven.gov.uk)





## REPORT TO COUNCIL

**REPORT OF:** Chief Executive

**REPORT NO:** SD022

**DATE:** 4 September 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>ANNUAL REVIEW OF PRIORITIES</b>	
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	Yes	
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	15 August 2008	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Yes – Policy Framework Proposal	
<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	ALL	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	ALL	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	YES	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	THIS REPORT IS AVAILABLE VIA THE LOCAL DEMOCRACY LINK ON THE COUNCIL'S WEBSITE <a href="http://WWW.SOUTHKESTEVEN.GOV.UK">WWW.SOUTHKESTEVEN.GOV.UK</a>	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  N/A	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	PDG presentations Annual Surveys	

## 1. **Introduction**

- 1.1 This report outlines the recent review of priorities, it also evaluates and recommends the repackaging of priorities into 4 broader "priority themes".
- 1.2 It is anticipated that the move to a priority theme approach will enable the Council to focus key resources in the longer term to delivering what is important to local people.

## 2. **Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Council approves the proposed repackaging of priorities under the 4 broader priority themes as outlined in this report.

## 3. **Background**

- 3.1 Our Corporate Plan sets out our key aims for the district and our residents. It contains our vision of providing brilliant services to our customers and is currently shaped around the following set of priorities.

### **Category A Priorities**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Scope</b>
Recycling	Improving the percentage of household waste recycled or composted.	Street Scene
Customer Service	Improving how we listen, and respond, to the needs of our customers	All services of the Council
Communications	Improving how the Council informs, and engages, with residents, stakeholders and staff	All sections of the Council
Bourne and Grantham town-centres	Improving the attractiveness, and economic vitality, of these town-centres.	Economic Development
Use of Resources	Improving the efficiency of the Council and developing the capacity to make it fit for purpose	All sections of the Council
Grantham Growth point	Securing growth status for Grantham and delivering this in a sustainable way.	Sustainable Communities

## **Category B Priorities**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Scope</b>
Local Neighbourhoods	Developing welcoming, safe and self-reliant communities with a strong sense of local identity.	Housing solutions Economic Development Anti-social behaviour
Housing Management	Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the services we provide to Council tenants	Tenancy Services
Public Assets	Ensuring all physical assets are fit for purpose and are managed efficiently	Assets and Facilities
Climate Change	Providing local leadership in both preventing and responding to changes in the environment	Healthy Environment

### **4. Current approach to priorities**

- 4.1 We have categorised services for the last four years to focus attention into areas where specific improvement in performance was required. The table below identifies the principles applied to that process :

<b>Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>
A	A service where the Council commits to achieving a step-change in performance over the next four years.
B	A service where the Council commits to delivering annual incremental improvement over the next four years
M	A service where the Council seeks to maintain service standards and outcomes over the next four years
Z	A service where the Council will implement a programme of managed disinvestment to secure the resources required to implement improvement in its priorities

- 4.2 This approach, which has received favourable comment from auditors, has greatly assisted the improvement of performance on discrete issues, enabled the alignment of resources and has delivered some very positive outcomes:
- recycling rates increased from 14% to 51.3% which is amongst the best recycling rates in the country
  - Improved street cleanliness with only 12 % of streets failing to meet acceptable standards in comparison with 19% in 2004/5
  - Met and exceeded target for delivery of affordable housing units
  - Addressed and reduced public concerns about anti-social behaviour

- 4.3 The current priorities were developed and adopted after considering views gained through consultation feedback, local intelligence and taking into account national targets.
- 4.4 There are now a number of drivers to look again at how we approach our priorities to ensure that we are able to identify more easily the benefits and outcomes for the customer/resident in priority areas. Council will seek to achieve efficiency gains so that resources can be directed to priority areas. These drivers include:
- the emerging Sustainable Community Strategy which incorporates Local Area Agreement themes including:
    - improving health,
    - improving skills and conditions for the economy,
    - making better communities through growth to improving housing provision,
    - providing value for money,
    - tackling the causes and effects of climate change.
  - the outcome of a Gateway Review on priorities by members of the Cabinet and PDG Chairs held on 14 July 2008 (reviewed progress with priorities)
  - up to date community feedback (e.g recent residents survey results)
  - feedback from recent inspections
  - a review of our medium term financial strategy .

## 5. **Outcome of Gateway Review**

- 5.1 At the gateway review event it was agreed that we need to ensure that the council's priorities continue to
- give a **clear direction** that everyone – Members, staff, partners, the community – understands;
  - **help us to focus** – we can't do everything;
  - **ensure we deliver** on local priorities.
- 5.2 It is recognised that the current approach has been effective in providing improved performance on one-off issues; for example recycling. However it is not necessarily the most effective way to deal with more holistic, longer term issues which require the input of the entire organisation (Team SK - Members and officers working together). For this reason it is now considered appropriate to adopt a more generic thematic approach to focussing our resources on what matters to local residents and businesses. This will ensure that all resources across the Council contribute to key objectives and make a real difference to local people.

## 6. **Proposals**

- 6.1 Our current approach involves 6 A priorities and 4 B priorities but we want to tie our priorities closer to the LAA themes and be clearer on the outcomes we want to achieve i.e. the difference our work makes to residents and other customers.

It is important to continue to focus on improving the customer experience in relation to:-

- **Quality** - high quality, reliable, flexible and responsive services which continuously strive to improve
- **Relevance** – tailoring services to meet specific needs of our community
- **Choice** - through a choice of access channels, putting the customer first
- **Consistent** - using information effectively to ensure the same level of service and same information available to all
- **Value for Money** - greater cost effectiveness, reliable and efficient with partners, to ensure value for money is achieved.

- 6.3 Taking the residents' survey into account and the outcome of the Gateway Review it is recommended that the following themes are agreed which will encompass the objectives contained within the current priorities.

### **Priority Themes**

<b>CUSTOMER FIRST</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>CURRENT PRIORITIES INCORPORATED</b>
Putting the customer at the heart of all we do	Excellent customer service and customer/ community access to services	Customer Service
<b>QUALITY LIVING</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>CURRENT PRIORITIES INCORPORATED</b>
Protection and improvement of our environment.  Improvement of health and well being.  Working with our partners to create communities where people are safe and feel safe.	A clean and safe environment in our towns and villages.  Improved health and well being.  Vibrant cohesive communities.	Recycling Local neighbourhoods Climate Change
<b>OPEN FOR BUSINESS</b>	<b>OUTCOME</b>	<b>CURRENT PRIORITIES INCORPORATED</b>
Develop strong, vibrant and inclusive communities with a strong economy	Revitalised local economy and communities	Grantham Growth and Town Centre regeneration

QUALITY ORGANISATION	OUTCOME	CURRENT PRIORITIES INCORPORATED
<p>A Council delivering brilliant services – further improve performance and satisfaction levels.</p> <p>Transforming the business and gaining value for money</p>	<p>An organisation that is customer-focussed, which values its staff, and which delivers brilliant services. To increase efficiency through the use of technology and working with others. To keep staff and members developed and motivated. To listen, consult and communicate well.</p>	<p>Communication Use of Resources Public Assets</p>

- 6.4 Our overriding aim is to achieve brilliant customer service and customer satisfaction. To do this we need to put the customer at the heart of what we do, get service delivery right first time at the first point of contact and put any mistakes right quickly
- 6.5 The term 'customer' is generic. It is intended to embrace citizens, members of the public, service users and clients. Whatever term we use, all customers have a common expectation - they simply want someone to do something about the issue with which they are most concerned, at their point of contact with us, and to be able to interact with us in a way in which suits them, listen to their views and respond as we work within constraints to make the district a better place to live. The adoption of a priority of "Customer First" will enable all staff to focus their efforts to achieve this aim.
- 6.6 It is our aim that people recognise and value the services we provide, to be confident that services are good value for money, and to feel that their voice is heard. We need to demonstrate that we use our limited resources effectively and efficiently, and that we engage customers to inform and help us focus on priorities. By adopting a priority of "Quality Organisation" will enable a focus on these objectives.
- 6.7 Feeling safe, living in good quality homes located on clean streets with easy access to parks and open spaces are important factors to everyone. Our residents have told us that these are some of the key issues that impact on their health, well being and overall satisfaction with their lives. It is also vital that we take action to protect our environment and ensure that the same quality of life can be enjoyed by future generations. Action on further improving recycling, minimizing waste, keeping our neighbourhoods clean and safe, encouraging active lifestyles and responding to climate change will be encompassed by a "Quality Living" theme.

- 6.8 "Open for Business"- Promoting investment in the economic and business development of the district in all sectors, to ensure that we have vibrant and inclusive communities with a sound economic base, and which are supported and enabled by the District Council. To do this going forward we will need to focus on supporting local businesses, ensuring that our town centres and rural villages provide opportunities for people to work and enjoy their leisure time. To achieve this we need to work with other public and private sector partners to ensure a quality environment and attract inward investment. A key objective of the revised approach will be to see South Kesteven develop its role as a main gateway to Lincolnshire and the wider East Midlands, taking the best advantage of its location, its environment and key transport links.

## **7. Measuring our success**

- 7.1 Strengthening our objectives and success measures is also a key aspect in the proposed approach. In making this change we will continue to track our progress and the difference we are making to local people through the use of success measures. For each objective there will be clear measures to help us identify the short, medium and longer term impact and outcomes of our actions. These details will be set out in priority theme plans and progress will be reported to Cabinet on a regular basis.
- 7.2 This revised approach to priorities has not been considered in isolation as it will directly influence the content of future service plans. Our service managers are actively contributing to the debate to strengthen our current approach to managing and improving our performance. These plans will translate the key actions from priority plans into team action plans. These form the basis of our staff appraisal process which sets individual targets and identifies training and development needs.

## **8. Conclusion**

- 8.1 The revised repackaging of priorities will encompass the issues outlined in our current categories but will enable us to clearly define where we will focus our attention and resources over the next three years to deliver outcomes for the local community. The actions contained within the current priorities would transfer into the broader priority themes. If approved, priority plans will be developed which will identify specific actions and these will be cascaded into service plans to ensure that the work of teams across the Council is focused in these priority areas.
- 8.2 We need to empower managers and staff to drive this forward in a way in which delegates decision making to the lowest possible level. We have started this process through our "being brilliant programme". Staff will need to have access to high quality training, systems, data and information if they are, consistently, to be able to deliver the excellent standards of customer service to which we aspire.

9. **Comments of the Council's S151 Officer**

- 9.1 The Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) sets out the framework for ensuring the Council's resources are allocated to the Council's priorities. The priority action plans (that will identify the outcomes for the community) will need to be fully costed with deliverable timescales in order that the budget setting process can allocate the necessary resources. The Council must continue to review the portfolio of services to consider whether future disinvestment in services is necessary having regard to the limited resources the Council has available. The MTFP also identifies that savings and efficiencies will also need to be found (utilising a range of efficiency options) in order to enable the Council to invest in priority services and ensure financial stability in the medium term.

10. **Comments of the Monitoring Officer**

- 10.1 Clear, well articulated priorities are essential to the delivery of good governance of the Council. The provision of broad themes will ensure actions can be started and finished in line with priority and service plans without constantly changing the priority themes.

11. **Contact Officers**

- 11.1 Beverly Agass, email: [b.agass@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:b.agass@southkesteven.gov.uk)  
Ian Yates, email: [i.yates@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:i.yates@southkesteven.gov.uk)  
Tracey Blackwell, email: [t.blackwell@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:t.blackwell@southkesteven.gov.uk)



## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: ECONOMIC PORTFOLIO HOLDER

REPORT NO.: PLA 713a

DATE: 4 September 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>ADOPTION OF LOCAL LIST OF INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED AS APPROPRIATE WITH AN APPLICATION UNDER THE PLANNING ACTS,</b>	
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	Yes	
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> July 2008.	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	KEY DECISION	
<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr Frances Cartwright Economic Development Portfolio	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Key Priority: to enhance Development Control Performance and it a legal requirement of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	Minor	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Local Democracy Link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  Yes	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  No

<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 DCLG circular advice 02/2008 Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (as amended) Report to Development Control Committee on 1 July 2008 Report to Cabinet 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2008 PLA713
---------------------------	---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On 6 April 2008 a new National Planning Application form was introduced together with an amendment to the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 (as amended) which set out the Statutory Requirements for plans and information to accompany a planning application.
- 1.2 These pieces of legislation set out for the first time the exact information required to support a planning application and crucially that an application is invalid if the required information is not attached.
- 1.3 It should be noted that the information is divided into two lists; the National List that sets out the mandatory requirements for all applications and a Local List that sets out optional information that a Local Planning Authority can request to support an application. ***[N.B. The proposed Local List is attached to report PLA713 as submitted to Cabinet on 11 August 2008. Due its size it has not been re-circulated with this report.]***
- 1.4 The Local List has no legal effect until it is published on the Council's website after adoption.
- 1.5 The report that follows was considered by Cabinet on 11 August and the recommendations therein accepted in full. Legislation requires that any Local List must be approved by the local authority.

## **2. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **2.1 That Council:**

- (1) Adopts the Local List which is attached to report PLA713 as submitted to Cabinet on 11 August 2008;**
- (2) Delegates the correction of any typographical errors, amplifications or amendments within the list, but not additional items to it, to the Corporate Head of Sustainable Communities.**

## **3 DETAILS OF REPORT**

### **3.1 Background**

- 3.1.1 The introduction of the National Single Application Form (1APP) for all applications made under the planning acts has been proposed by the government during the previous two years and was introduced on 6 April 2008. Access to this document is made via the Planning Portal which automatically directs the applicant to the correct form and inserts the Council's Logo onto the forms. The use of the Planning Portal and electronic forms is part of the Government's objectives to promote "E-Government".
- 3.1.2 The use of E-forms and an electronic submission results in the elimination of the applicant having to submit hard copy plans. This is viewed as a cost saving to the development industry and providing for the speedier transmission of information during the consultation process. This is seen as enhancing the performance of Local Planning Authorities and dovetails with the recent reports submitted to the Development Services Manager from consultants provided by the Planning Advisory Service.
- 3.1.3 The Lead Professional has liaised with the Head of Development Control at Boston Borough Council so that the drafting time has been shared between the two Authorities and is therefore a joint document.

## **4. Information**

- 4.1.1 The Local List comprises matters taken from a "List" compiled by the Government and is not a list of matters considered suitable by Officers. Your Officers have considered whether there are any purely Local Matters that should be included and concluded that it was not necessary because, for example, the marketing of redundant agricultural barns for commercial purposes before allowing residential use, could be included in the headings in the National List. The difference between matters included in

the National List and those that are not is that the former matters when not submitted with the application render it invalid, whilst the latter if not submitted have to be requested using another Article in the General Development Procedure Order.

- 4.1.2 South Kesteven District Council and Boston Borough Council have, along with every other Local planning Authority, selected every matter on the list with the exception of issues relating to Minerals. This is because Local planning Authorities never determine Mineral applications and every other matter may be necessary for a particular application.
- 4.1.3 The Governments overarching concept is that an LPA should only ask for information necessary to determine an application. There is a mechanism to resolve disputes between parties if there is disagreement.
- 4.1.4 The drafting of the Lists together with their adoption is one of the tasks of the Improvement Plan Board for Development Control and adoption will enable the requirements to be notified to the Planning Portal. This is one of the elements that, together with electronic consultation will contribute to efficiency improvements in Development Control.

## **4.2 Consultation**

- 4.2.1 The Circular advocates 6 weeks consultation but this is not a legal requirement. Other Lincolnshire Authorities have undertaken the exercise and a selection of Planning Agents who attended a forum did not demur when told that this Council did not propose to consult on the matter. A number agreed that it would not be a useful exercise.
- 4.2.2 Your Officers do not advocate consultation because it is considered that little response would be engendered and, in truth, little or no change would be made to the list. As stated the Local List has been extracted from the Government list with the same phraseology being used. It is considered that it would be a waste of Council resources.
- 4.2.3 In any event the earlier report to Cabinet has already been published on the Council's web site. Minor typographical changes have been made to the Local List but nothing has been added and the substance remains the same.

## **4.3 Operation**

- 4.3.1 It is considered that the contents of the List speak for themselves and therefore this report will confine itself to outline the proposed method of operation of the List.

- 4.3.2 The list will be published on the Council's web site and some 150 agents (defined as being persons who have made two or more planning applications to the Council in the last five years) will be notified directly of its existence
- 4.3.2 Pre-application discussions are to be encouraged between the developer and planning officers. The Development Services Manager and Customer Services Manager have agreed alternate methods of communication to ensure that there is access to planning officers by developers. The usual methods of assisting persons whose first language is not English are available. Planning Officers will validate applications because their professional judgement is needed to determine whether an application is valid.
- 4.3.3 A valid application should mean that sufficient detail is included for consultees to be able to make meaningful judgement about the application. In this regard it is considered that this will enhance the Consultation Process with Parish Councils because more and clearer information is attached to an application form. It is also considered that the process can be undertaken in a more timely fashion because there will be fewer requests for additional information and that this will contribute to sustained performance in Development Control.

## **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

- 5.1 No direct financial implications arising from this report.

## **6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

- 6.1 The Planning and Compensation Act 2004 amends the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to introduce the requirement for a list as detailed in this report. The government has produced a national list of matters required, a locally produced list can add to those requirements but cannot detract. The local list should be compiled from a recommended national list of additional information which the planning authority can require to validate an application. If a local list is not adopted, the statutory requirements of the national list would prevail.

The overall content of any local list will be at the discretion of the local planning authority.

Guidance recommends consultation on the contents of any local list. It is recommended to ensure the list is clear and transparent to local applicants.

## **7. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER**

### **7.1 Comments of Planning Policy Manager**

- 7.1.1 The adoption of this list is a necessary element of delivering the Development Management function at the council.

### **7.2 Comments of Economic Development Manager**

- 7.2.1 Welcome the inclusion of strategic economic development and regeneration elements within the Local List which requires information to support applications for development in both Bourne and Grantham Town Centres as well as in other employment areas that the Council is promoting.

### **7.3 Comments of the Grantham Growth Point Project Officer**

- 7.3.1 The Grantham Growth Point team welcomes the Local List and acknowledges its alignment and relationship to visioning work currently being undertaken for Grantham.

### **7.4 Comments of Local Strategic Partnership Co-ordinator**

- 7.4.1 The Sustainable Communities Plan (SCP) is currently being prepared. It is essential that planning applications demonstrate the objectives of the LSP such as details of Community Involvement before submission of the scheme.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 The adoption of the Local List will provide clarity to developers, enhance the consultation process and contribute to the sustained performance of Development Control.

## **9. CONTACT OFFICERS**

Mark Shipman / Stuart Vickers  
Development Control Services  
01476 406386  
[m.shipman@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:m.shipman@southkesteven.gov.uk)

## INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT PRO FORMA

Section:  Development Control	Names of those undertaking assessment: Bryan Wolsey Stuart Vickers	
Name of Policy to be assessed: Local List	Date of Assessment: 19 <sup>th</sup> August 2008	Is this a new or existing policy?: New
1. Briefly describe the aims, objectives and purpose of the policy: To set out clear rules for the submission of planning applications		
2. What are the key performance indicators? The submission and registration of planning applications in a timely fashion.		
3. Who will be affected by this policy? Planning agents and applicants		
4. Who is intended to benefit from this policy and in what way? The whole planning service through a consistency of approach		
5. Are there any other organisations involved in the delivery of the service? Consultees such as the County Highway Authority		
6. What outcomes are required from this strategy and for whom? Clear and consistent approach to the submission of applications		
7. What factors/forces could contribute/detract from the outcomes? None evident		
8. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the policy? The Council, applicants, agents.		
9. Who implements the policy, and who is responsible for the policy? Development Control staff		
10. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on different racial groups? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? No concerns		
11. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on men and women? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this? No concerns		
12. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on disabled people? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for		

<p>this?</p> <p>No concerns</p>
<p>13. Are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact on the grounds of sexual orientation? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No concerns</p>
<p>14. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of age? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No concerns</p>
<p>15. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on the grounds of religious belief? If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No concerns</p>
<p>16. Are there concerns that the policy <u>could</u> have a differential impact on any other groups of people eg those with dependants/caring responsibilities, those with an offending past, those with learning difficulties, transgendered or transsexual people. If yes, please explain. What existing evidence (either presumed or otherwise) do you have for this?</p> <p>No concerns</p>
<p>17. Are there any obvious barriers to accessing the service eg language, physical access?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>18. Where do you think improvements could be made?</p> <p>None</p>
<p>19. Are there any unmet needs or requirements that can be identified that affect specific groups. If yes, please give details.</p> <p>No</p>
<p>20. Is there a complaints system?</p> <p>None as such: Council Complaints system will apply</p>
<p>21. Do we monitor complaints by race, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religious belief?</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>22. Do we have feedback from managers or frontline staff?</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>23. Is there any feedback from voluntary/community organisations?</p>



Yes
24. Is there any research or models of practice that may inform our view? No, it is a new national system
25. Could the differential impact identified in 8 – 16 amount to there being unlawful discrimination in respect of this policy?  Not applicable
26. Could the differential impact identified in 8-16 amount to there being the potential for adverse impact in this policy? Not applicable
27. Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group? Or any other reason?  Not applicable
28. Should the policy proceed to a full impact assessment? yes
29. Date on which Full assessment to be completed by  Council meeting
Signed (Lead Officer): ...B E Wolsey for Mark Shipman.....  Date: 19 <sup>th</sup> August 2008.....

# MINUTES

CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, 14 JULY 2008



---

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Reginald Howard  
Councillor Kenneth Joynson  
Councillor Peter Martin-Mayhew  
(Chairman)

Councillor Andrea Webster (Vice-  
Chairman)  
Councillor Raymond Wootten

## OFFICERS

Legal Services Manager (Monitoring  
Officer)  
Democratic Officer

## OTHER MEMBERS

(none)

---

## 8. MEMBERSHIP

The Committee were informed that Councillor Howard was substituting for Councillor Susan Sandall for this meeting only.

## 9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations received.

## 10. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 3RD JUNE 2008

The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd June were approved as a correct record of the decisions taken.

## 11. PROCEDURE FOR RECORDING DECISIONS DELEGATED TO OFFICERS - PROTOCOL

### *Decision*

*That the Constitution Committee recommends to the Governance and Audit Committee the changes shown in the protocol appended to report LEG022, together with the following amendments:*



"Listening Learning Delivering"

**South Kesteven District Council**

STAMFORD • GRANTHAM • BOURNE • THE DEEPINGS

**5.1 That reference to any monetary value (£10,000) is removed from this section.**

**5.7 That the Monitoring Officer should maintain a central record of all delegated decisions with copies of the relevant documentation for a minimum period of six years.**

***That the protocol should be undertaken for a trial period of 12 months and a report submitted to the Constitution Committee at the end of this period. That a quarterly report on those decisions taken by Officers under delegated powers be submitted to the Scrutiny Committee for information purposes.***

The Monitoring Officer referred to the protocol that had been circulated to Members following the last meeting of the Committee. This protocol dealt with how decisions, taken under delegated powers, should be recorded by Officers. She referred to those decisions taken by Council, Cabinet and Portfolio Holders which were all recorded and open to the Public's inspection. Currently, however, decisions taken by Officers under delegated powers were not recorded anywhere and this protocol set out to address this to make the process more transparent.

Members felt that it was necessary to have such a protocol in place and asked where the decisions would be kept. The Monitoring Officer said that they would be centrally logged in legal and a copy of the report and the decision report would be kept there. The Monitoring Officer said that resources were not available to question every single decision made under delegated powers but she would be checking that decision reports had been completed correctly. Members agreed that the Monitoring Officer should keep a copy of the decisions and that they should be kept for a minimum of six years and this should be reflected at 5.7 in the protocol. The issue of what is a significant monetary value was also discussed and the Committee agreed that reference to the figure of £10,000 should be removed from section 5.1.

In order to be open and transparent all decisions taken under delegated should be recorded in this way Members were adamant that all no section should be exempt.

The Monitoring Officer indicated that the protocol be trialled for a 12 month period with perhaps a report being submitted to the Scrutiny

Committee quarterly on the number of decisions made and a report submitted to the Constitution Committee at the end of the trial period detailing the number of decisions made and changes that perhaps could be made to the protocol, also whether or not it needed to be included within the Constitution. Members agreed that a trial period was a good idea as this would throw up any changes that needed to be made to evolve the document.

Members then discussed where they could view the decisions made and the Monitoring Officer suggested that they could be placed on the intranet or internet once the system was in use.

## **12. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION**

### ***Decision***

***That the Constitution Committee recommends to Council that the amendments to the scheme of delegation contained within report LEG021 be approved together with the following:***

***Page 99 of the Constitution to have the following amendments as underlined added:***

***8. To approve permits for public collections for charitable or other purposes under the provisions of the Charities Act 1992 and 2006 when the Act comes into force, and other relevant statutory provisions.***

***Table below 9 on page 99 – to read as follows:***

<b><i>Act</i></b>	<b><i>Function</i></b>
<b><i>Local Government Miscellaneous Act 1982</i></b>	<b><i>Street Trading</i></b>
<b><i>Licensing Act 2004</i></b>	<b><i>Alcohol Licensing</i></b>
<b><i>Gambling Act 2005</i></b>	<b><i>Gambling</i></b>

***Item 12 within report LEG021 to include at 20, 21 22 and 23.***  
***Item 15 within report LEG021 to include Anti Social Behaviour Officers and Legal Officers***

The Monitoring Officer referred to report LEG021 which contained minor amendments to the Scheme of delegation contained within the Constitution and she highlighted three specific delegations concerning Tenancy Services and Healthy Environment. Most of the delegation amendments concerned who made decisions when the Corporate Head of the section was absent. Corporate Heads had

been invited to attend the Committee by the Monitoring Officer to support their proposals.

Members agreed with the proposed delegations as outlined by report LEG021 and the Monitoring Officer but were disappointed that no Corporate Heads had attended. The Constitution was the document which underpinned the decisions made by both by Cabinet, Council and Officers to make them open and transparent to the public and Members felt that it was not perhaps given the recognition that it should have.

### **13. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 11.30am. An item for inclusion on the October agenda was the terms of reference of the Scrutiny Committee and Policy Development Groups.

## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: THE LEADER

REPORT NO. CAB009

DATE: 1 SEPTEMBER 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>LEADER'S REPORT ON URGENT NON KEY DECISIONS</b>
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	No
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	N/A
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	N/A

<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Councillor Linda Neal, Leader of the Council	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Corporate Governance	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	None	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	Reports taken into consideration in the making of these decisions can be accessed electronically via the Local Democracy link on the Council's website <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  <b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  <b>No</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Non Key decision report numbers CHFR092 and SD021	

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This report is to inform the Council of two non key decisions taken since the last report to Council on 19 June 2008 under Access to Information Procedure Rule 23.4.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

**Members are asked to note these decisions in accordance with Access to Information Procedure Rule 17.3**

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

**(i) Urgent Non Key Decision made on 12 June 2008 by the Portfolio Holder for Assets & Resources.**

### **Award of Insurance Contract**

#### **Decision:**

**That approval is granted to award the Council's insurance contract to Zurich Municipal for a period of three years (with an option to extend for two further periods each of two years duration) with effect from 1st July 2008.**

This decision was taken as a matter of urgency because: The Council's current insurance contract expired on 30th June 2008. Insurance arrangements needed to be in place by 1st July in order for the Council to operate legally.

**(ii) Urgent Non Key Decision made on 11 August 2008 by the Corporate Governance and Community Leadership Portfolio Holder.**

### **Flying the Flag (London 2012 Handover Celebrations 24 August to 30 September 2008)**

**DECISION: that approval be granted to fly the Union style flag as shown at appendix "A" to report SD021 between 24 August and 30 September 2008 from the District Council flag pole in front of the Civic suite at the Council Offices, St. Peter's Hill, Grantham.**

This decision was taken as a matter of urgency because: the flag organisers needed a decision by 8 August 2008.

#### **4. OPTION ANALYSIS**

As contained in reports CHFR092 and SD021.

#### **5. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

This report is required in accordance with procedures outlined within the Constitution.

#### **6. CONTACT OFFICERS**

- (1) Interim Corporate Head, Finance & Resources: Richard Wyles 01476 406120**
- (2) Acting Chief Executive, Ian Yates 01476 406201**



## REPORT TO COUNCIL

REPORT OF: SCRUTINY SUPPORT OFFICER

REPORT NO.: DEM017

DATE: 4 SEPTEMBER 2008

<b>TITLE:</b>	OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT TO COUNCIL
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	N/A
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	N/A
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	N/A

<b>COUNCIL AIMS/ PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	COUNCILLOR PAUL CARPENTER – ORGANISATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	ACCESS	
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	NONE	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Local Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  <b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>  <b>No</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Agendas, minutes and notes of the Scrutiny Committee and working groups 2007-08	

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Under Part 2, Article 6.4.2 of the Constitution the Scrutiny Committee must report annually to the Council on its workings.

This is the first report to Council since the restructuring of Scrutiny arrangements. This report covers the period from May 2007 to the end of April 2008.

The report provides a summary of the work undertaken by the Scrutiny Committee during the course of the year.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

The Council is asked to note the report

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

Details of the work undertaken by the Scrutiny Committee are contained within the report. The work undertaken was selected by the Members of the Committee. Only one decision was called in during the course of the year.

A feature of good Scrutiny is that meetings be held in places other than the Council Offices. This has happened on a number of occasions, including visits to New College in Stamford and Grantham College, and the Committee were keen for this to continue.

## **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED**

Not applicable

## **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

It is essential that the scrutiny function remains a key focus to ensure good corporate governance.

## **6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

It is requirement under Part 2 of the Constitution that the Scrutiny Committee must report annually to the Council meetings on its workings.

## **7. COMMENTS OF THE DEMOCRACY SERVICE MANAGER**

The Scrutiny Committee is supported by the members of the democracy services team who have specialised knowledge in this aspect of the modernised political management arrangements. Officers attend training and conference events to keep up to date with this developing area of work.

## **8. CONTACT OFFICER**

David Lambley – Scrutiny Support Officer – 01476 40 62 97  
[d.lambley@southkesteven.gov.uk](mailto:d.lambley@southkesteven.gov.uk)

# **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT MAY 2007 – APRIL 2008**

## **Foreword**

I believe that to make a positive difference to Local Government the work of Scrutiny must be of a sufficient standard to encourage our decision makers to listen to and take seriously their advice.

Therefore, there has to be a good relationship between scrutineers and those responsible for the work being scrutinised. To achieve this requires several important functions.

Firstly, Scrutiny Committee must prove by its work that it has important things to say after proper examination of the evidence.

Secondly, while its decisions may be critical of the establishment they should also be supportive and even handed.

Thirdly, we should be cooperative with policy development groups in trying to avoid the overlapping of work. However our decisions must not be compromised.

Fourthly, we also need to play our part in ensuring maximum effectiveness in the wider arenas such as health and education. Closer cooperation is also needed with other Scrutiny organisations.

These principles are relatively easy to identify but more difficult to implement. However, I am pleased to report that our Committee Members and officers have achieved a great deal towards these aims and it is a pleasure to congratulate them on their positive contributions.

I attended a meeting about Parliamentary Select Committees and their relationship with Scrutiny. It was pleasing to see that we were adopting many of their procedures. In particular there was complete cooperation between members of different political parties. I am really grateful as Chairman for this partnership which makes our decisions so much more forceful. Thank you all.

Councillor Ken Joynson  
Scrutiny Committee Chairman

## Introduction

Overview and Scrutiny was introduced as part of the modernisation agenda for Local Government in the Local Government Act 2000. The Overview and Scrutiny process influences decisions, but does not make them.

The role of scrutiny:

- To provide a “critical friend” challenge to the Executive as well as external authorities and agencies
- To reflect the voice and concerns of the public and its communities
- Scrutiny Members should take the lead and own the Scrutiny Process on behalf of the public
- Scrutiny should make an impact on the delivery of public services

The Scrutiny Committee is politically balanced and made up of 11 non-Executive members of the Council. The Committee provides an opportunity for Members to challenge decisions made by the Executive.

The Scrutiny Committee has a responsibility to monitor the performance of the Council, consider its decisions, question how those decisions were made and to recommend improvements.

The Scrutiny Committee also undertakes external Scrutiny to examine the wider issues that affect people living within the district.

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Chairman: Councillor Joynson

Vice Chairman: Councillor Mrs Smith

Meeting Date	Commentary
29 May 2007	The Committee met for the first time to discuss the work programme for the year and to consider the "Shaping Health in Lincolnshire" consultation document received from Lincolnshire Primary Care Trust. The Committee agreed to establish a Health Working Group to attend consultation events and to consider the matter further at the July 2007 meeting.
20 June 2007	This meeting was a call-in of a decision regarding the appointment of consultants to undertaken a market service review. The Committee discussed the agreed to accept the portfolio holder's decision to appoint the consultants and it was therefore implemented.
31 July 2007  Held at New College, Stamford	<p>The Principal of New College presented the plans for the future of the college and the Committee discussed these plans and the performance of the college. The Committee scrutinised education provision for the 16-19 age group within Stamford.</p> <p>The Committee discussed a report by the Health Working Group in response to the Shaping Health in Lincolnshire consultation document. The Committee recommended how the Council respond to the consultation. It was agreed that the Health Working Group continue to monitor health matters.</p>
25 September 2007	The performance of the new Customer Service Centre was scrutinised by the Committee. The Committee toured the Customer Service Centre and possible solutions to missed calls and improving customer service were discussed. The Committee endorsed the steps set out in the recovery plan and

	<p>resolved to establish a working group to monitor the future performance of the Customer Service Centre.</p> <p>Members considered the issue of proposed Post Office closures and the importance and viability of services within rural areas.</p> <p>The Committee discussed the issue of Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) and members of the Committee had attended and agreed to attend further meetings of the South Holland District Council's PCSO Scrutiny Task Group. It was felt that there was a general public apathy towards the Police Community Panels within the district. The Committee agreed to receive regular updates.</p>
2 November 2007	<p>The Scrutiny Committee held a joint meeting with the Engagement PDG to discuss the consultation document from the Post Office regarding the proposed closures of various Post Offices within the district and the replacement of some Post Offices with limited Outreach services. The meeting raised a number of issues with regard to the Post Office service, particularly the importance of Post Office services in rural areas. The Committee recommended the Council oppose a number of the closures and formulated the Council's response to the consultation. The Post Office on Ryhall Road in Stamford was successfully kept open.</p>
20 November 2007  Held in the Guildhall Arts Centre	<p>The working group monitoring the Customer Service Centre advised the Committee of the improvements in performance that had been made since the September meeting and would continue to monitor developments.</p> <p>The Committee scrutinised Council representation on the board of South Lincolnshire Blind Society. It was agreed to recommend that the Council appoint a representative at the next full Council meeting.</p> <p>Members discussed the issue of rural transport, including the Dial-A-Ride scheme and any future replacement service. The Committee agreed to</p>

	<p>establish a Transport Working Group to investigate the issue of rural transport and the Dial-A-Ride scheme.</p>
<p>22 January 2008</p> <p>Held at Grantham College</p>	<p>The Scrutiny Committee discussed the performance of Grantham College and its plans for potential development.</p> <p>The Customer Service Centre Working Group reported that the CSC was continuing to improve its performance.</p> <p>The outcome of the consultation relating to Post Office closures was scrutinised. The Committee noted its disappointment that more information regarding the business case for the closure of various Post Offices could not be provided.</p> <p>The Committee noted their concerns regarding section 106 agreements and other planning issues. It was agreed to request a member of the Scrutiny Committee be invited to sit on the Development Control Committee Working Group looking at various planning issues.</p> <p>The use of "exempt session" within various Council meetings was scrutinised by the Committee. The Committee took the view that, particularly within Development Control Committee meetings, exempt session was used too often which could harm the public's perception of transparency within local government.</p>
<p>26 February 2008</p>	<p>The Scrutiny Committee scrutinised planning issues, with a focus on section 106 agreements. The Committee discussed current policy and what future changes might occur.</p> <p>The Health Working Group reported on their last meeting concerning the response to the "Shaping Health in Lincolnshire" consultation. There was some concern that the Council's representations had largely been ignored.</p>



	<p>The Transport Working Group were looking into alternative arrangements for Dial-A-Ride.</p> <p>Staff and Councillor communications were discussed. It was noted that the new intranet was particularly useful. Team SK booklets providing a "who's who" of staff within the Council and posters and booklets to raise Councillor profiles had been produced. Councillor "speed dating" sessions had been held to allow Councillors to meet staff from different service areas to improve understanding between staff and Councillors.</p>
<p>1 April 2008</p> <p>Held in Guildhall Arts Centre</p>	<p>The Scrutiny Committee reviewed their work over the course of the year and concluded that it had been a successful year. It was noted that the Scrutiny Committee welcomed Councillors who were not members of the Committee to attend, and particularly welcomed attendance by members of the public.</p> <p>The Committee agreed meeting dates for the 2008/09 year and discussed possible issues to consider over the forthcoming year, both externally and internally within the Council.</p>

## WORKING GROUPS 2007-2008

Working Group	Remit
<p>Health</p> <p>Councillors Farrar, Higgs, Jalili and Hearmon</p>	<p>To monitor health related issues and to report to the Committee on any issues that may affect health within the District. The group has reported on the "Shaping Health in Lincolnshire" consultation for the Scrutiny Committee.</p>
<p>Customer Service Centre</p> <p>Councillors Mrs Bosworth and Higgs</p>	<p>To continue to monitor and report on the performance of the Customer Service Centre.</p>
<p>Transport</p> <p>Councillors Farrar, Helyar, Mrs Smith and Williams</p>	<p>To investigate alternatives to the Dial-A-Ride scheme and to consider general transport issues within the district, particularly in rural areas.</p>